

3751  
A  
MODEST APOLOGY,

Ec. Ec.

---



MODERN GEOLOGY

By J. C.

---



A  
MODEST APOLOGY  
FOR THE  
ROMAN CATHOLICS  
OF

*Great Britain: K*

ADDRESSED TO

ALL MODERATE PROTESTANTS;

PARTICULARLY TO

THE MEMBERS OF BOTH HOUSES OF  
PARLIAMENT.

*By Dr. Seddes*

---

LONDON:

PRINTED FOR THE AUTHOR,

BY DAVIS, TAYLOR, AND WILKS, CHANCERY-LANE;

AND SOLD BY R. FAULDER, AND T. BOOKER,  
NEW BOND-STREET.

1800.

[Price Seven Shillings.]

MODERATE APOLOGY

FOR THE

ROMAN CATHOLICS

OF

Great Britain:



ALL MODERATE PROTESTANTS

PARTICULARLY TO

THE MEMBERS OF BOTH HOUSES OF  
PARLIAMENT.

LONDON:

PRINTED FOR THE AUTHOR,

AT NO. 1, AVON, AND WATER, CHANCERY-LANE,

AND SOLD BY R. FARRER, AND T. BAKER,  
NEW BOND-STREET.

1801.

[Printer's mark]

---

## INTRODUCTION.

---

**A** CONSIDERABLE part of the following Sheets was written some twenty years ago ; at a period when the British Legislature first seriously thought of relaxing the Penal Laws which, at different times, and under various pretexts, had been enacted against professed Roman Catholics, commonly denominated Papists ; who under the weight of those Laws had now groaned for more than a century. But the noise and clamour which that relaxation, small as it was, raised throughout the Island, and the disturbances that ensued from Protestant Committees and Associations, induced the Author [to give up the idea of then printing and publishing ; left, instead of conciliating, he should irritate the minds of men, not yet suffi-



ciently ripe for that liberality of sentiment, which has been since gradually maturing.

When a new Indulgence was about to be granted to us, in the thirty-first year of his Majesty's reign, it was again my intention to come forward with my *Apology*. But a particular Friend, a Member of Parliament, now no more, remarking to me, that my labour would be unnecessary, as he believed that it was the design of Administration to get every penalty and disability, which the Roman Catholics complained of, swept away, at once, by One comprehensive and effectual Act—again I dropped my pen, and threw aside my almost finished Performance.

My Friend, however, was deceived; and we were disappointed. Much indeed was done for us; but, in my apprehension, not enough. We can yet scarcely call ourselves Britons: free Britons we cannot call ourselves. Several hard and disgracing Laws against us are still unrepealed—We are disabled not only from sitting in either House of Parliament, but even from voting at the Elections of those who sit there.—We are not admitted into the Army, the Navy, or even the Militia, unless by connivance: and from all Civil Offices we are absolutely excluded.—We are debarred from the National Seminaries



naries of learning; yet cannot endow Schools or Colleges for the education of our own children.—We cannot present to Advowsons; a privilege not denied even to Quakers, who take no Oaths to Government.—In short, there is no disability, that affects any other class of Dissenters, which affects not equally the Roman Catholics; while there are several disabilities to which the latter are liable, that do not, in any respect, affect the former.

It will perhaps be said—I have heard it said—That there is in the existing Laws against us nothing *very severe*; nothing that subjects us to either *Death, Imprisonment, or Fine*: and that all that we have to bear is the privation of certain civil Rights, which has been deemed, if not absolutely necessary, yet highly expedient, for the purpose of guarding against the intrusion of *Papery*, and securing the Rights of *Protestants*! —Is it then possible, that the Protestants of Great Britain, at this moment, think their rights insecure, unless their Roman Catholic brethren be excluded from the common rights of subjects? Is it possible, that the present belief or practices of the British Catholics can, by any thinking Protestant, be deemed dangerous to the State, hostile to the Constitution, or hurtful to Society? —Whence then (I have often said to myself),

whence then is it, that we meet with so much idle declamation, even in writers of note and respectability, about the alarming dangers to be dreaded from the toleration and spread of Popery ; and the necessity of restricting Papists by, at least, disabling Statutes ?—Doubtless, thought I, it must be owing to a mere *Misapprehension* of our real Principles : for I am unwilling to imagine that there is aught of *Misrepresentation* in the case : and this it was, that first suggested to me the Idea of writing a MODEST APOLOGY ; and now prompts me to publish it for the perusal of MODERATE PROTESTANTS.

For, although, at the time when I first formed my plan, prejudices against us ran much higher, than at this day ; yet, even at this day, prejudices are kept up by men of worth, learning, dignity, and rank ; whose influence among the people is great, and whose authority has a powerful effect, in reviving an expiring odium, and re embittering the draught of obloquy, which we have been so long doomed to drink.

I allow that some of our own writers have imprudently contributed to the mingling of this cup ; and given sometimes just occasion for the conduct of our adversaries, by unreasonable and virulent attacks upon Protestantism, and a pernicious

nacious defence of certain Doctrines and Points of Discipline, which are certainly not *Catholic*; although they may be called *Popish* Doctrines and *Popish* Points of Discipline. But it is hard, that the indiscretion and violence of a few Individuals should hurt the whole Body of British Catholics, who disapprove of that violence, condemn that indiscretion, and disclaim every Doctrine that is not truly and strictly *Catholic*, in the genuine meaning of the term.

If a recent respectable writer \* had contented himself with repelling the odious accusations, and animadverting on the injurious reflections, of the *Historian* of *Winchester*; the Roman Catholics would have had no cause of complaint: many of them would have been well-pleased; and none of them, I believe, would have justified the conduct of his antagonist. But the very title of his book † seems to point at the Roman Catholics of Great Britain, under the nick-name of *Papists*, as dangerous to that Government under which they live, and hurtful to that Society in which

\* Dr. Sturges, Prebendary of Winchester, Chancellor of that Diocese, and one of his Majesty's Chaplains in Ordinary.

† *Reflections on the Principles and Institutions of Popery, with reference to Civil Society and Government; especially that of this Kingdom.*

they



they mix.—And whoever reads the work itself with attention, will be apt to think, that a share of the reprehensions intended for Mr. Milner, and due to Mr. Milner, is indirectly transferred to all those of the Roman Catholic persuasion; whose Religion is vulgarly known by the name of Popery. I am persuaded that Dr. Sturges meant us no material harm: but shafts shot at random sometimes do as much mischief as the best aimed arrows: and, to the wounded, it matters not, what might be the intention of the bow-man.—His Tract is evidently, although not intentionally, calculated to prepossess his readers, not merely against the writer, whose work he justly censures, but against all those who bear the name of Roman Catholics.—With sincere pleasure I remark that the candid author has, in a second edition, mollified some asperities which hurt me in the first edition; and blunted the points of his darts, with respect to that class of Catholics, who, as he candidly observes, are far from being Papists, or favourable to Papal usurpations\*. This does honour to both his

\* See his Appendix, p. 263, which he concludes thus:  
 “The principles which I have combated in the foregoing  
 “Letters are not those of the Protestant Catholics: but of  
 “such as dissent from the terms, or depart from the spirit, of  
 “the Protestation.”



heart and his understanding; and is perfectly analogous to the conception which the writer of this had formed of Dr. Sturges's character.

For one thing we are greatly obliged to him: his valuable testimony against those writers, who childishly imagine that there is danger to be apprehended, in this kingdom, from the increase and spread of Popery \*: one of the greatest delusions that can well be entertained. The number of Roman Catholics has been diminishing for a century back; and we have not at present above one half of Clergymen that we had but a few years ago: and many of these are almost starving for want of bread. I here put the French Emigrants out of the question. They are only birds of passage; and, as far as I have seen of them, very little disposed, and for the

\* "No time can seem more unfavourable than the present  
 "for the success of the Roman Catholic Religion, in every  
 "part of the world, or more discouraging to the hopes of its  
 "zealous partisans . . . . But for this country, especially,  
 "there seems to me little reason to apprehend the increase of  
 "Popery in any serious point of view. The good sense of  
 "the Nation is proof against it; their disinclination to it hereditary; it is discordant with the character of our People,  
 "and the genius of our Government; and our established  
 "Church is inseparably united with our Civil Constitution."

P. 254, 255.

most

most part, very little capacitated, to make professy-  
lytes of English Protestants.

I must also applaud, and subscribe to, the following precious words : “ In quiet times like  
“ the present, the who agitates the minds of men,  
“ and awakens their passions by discussing with  
“ warmth and severity religious differences, appears to me to do an ill office to society. It  
“ lessens Christian charity ; the want of which  
“ is, in my opinion, the worst of heresies. Of  
“ what weight in the balance are a few professy-  
“ lytes, gained on either side, when opposed to  
“ this ? In the common intercourse of life, men  
“ are apt to treat and think of each other, as they  
“ appear to perform its social duties. If I see a  
“ man a good Father, a good Husband, or a  
“ good Son, and a good Member of the Community at large ; I esteem him, without stopping to inquire, what is his religious denomination. I am ready to embrace him, as the  
“ creature of our common Father Creator, as  
“ the disciple of our common Master ; and to  
“ conclude, that in whatever way he offers his  
“ petitions to Heaven in these capacities, and  
“ offers them sincerely, he will therefore be accepted. *I presume not to judge another's servant ; to his own master he standeth or falleth.*  
“ Suffer

“Suffer us to be good Christians and good  
“Friends, without trying to persuade us, that we  
“ought to be Enemies.” Lett. i. p. 5, 6.

All this is truly Christian, truly Catholic : and we wish no more, than that our Catholicity and Christianity may be tried by this criterion. Let our conduct in life be inspected ; and if our *Men* be not as good Fathers, Husbands, and Sons ; our *Women* as good Mothers, Wives, and Daughters, as the Protestants among whom they live ; let them be driven from Society, and proscribed from social rights.

If, in some other respects, they appear *unsocial*, it is chiefly owing to a foreign education ; which they were long obliged to mendicate in abroad, and which gave them uncouth, uncourtly habits they seldom overcame. Some vestiges of this education are still visible ; but time will efface them, and has already, in a great measure, made them less apparent. Communicate to them the blessings of British Freedom—admit them to a participation of British Privileges—open to them the way to meritorious Preferment—Humble them not by special restrictions—disgrace them not by peculiar disabilities—Put it in their power to blend with Society, in every place and on all occasions, without marks of ignominy on their faces—and they will soon become as social as any  
other



other members of society. Their prominent features will be softened down to the common stamp; and Papist and Protestant will, in the intercourse of life, resemble one another so much, that their respective peculiarities will hardly be discernible.

Nay more: If Government seriously wish to diminish the number of Roman Catholics in this kingdom, I will venture to affirm, that the most effectual means will be, to adopt the measures I have just mentioned. For, so long as there are disabling Laws against them, so long will they remain alienated from Protestantism, and, were it but from mere obstinacy, adhere to their native principles and opinions.

There is every reason then to hope, that a total repeal of the disabling Laws, which particularly affect the Roman Catholics of Great Britain, will speedily be taken into Parliamentary consideration, and repealed *in toto*: and that they will, at least, be put upon the same footing with Protestant Dissenters; as it cannot be denied, that they are as loyal Subjects as the Dissenting Protestants, or any other Protestants of the land.

The late Motion made by a Noble Lord, in the House of Peers, and the manner in which it was received, encourage us to look for all this:  
and,



and, indeed, it is no more than political justice seems to demand : not to mention the native generosity of *British* Legislators, and their high sense of national honour ; which must ever prompt them to just, generous, and honourable deeds. —And let it not be argued, that *Disability* is not *Persecution*. To the unignoble mind, every civil *Disability* is a *Disgrace* : and a disgrace of such a nature, as that every positive persecution, short of banishment or death, might seem preferable. Nay death itself, inflicted for mere matters of Religion, would be less intolerable : it would be accounted honourable Martyrdom. But civil *Disability* is accompanied with infamy in this life, without posthumous renown.

---

and, indeed, it is no more than political justice  
to demand; not to mention the native  
generosity of British Legislators, and their high  
sense of national honour; which may ever prompt  
them to just, bold, and honourable deeds.  
—And let it not be argued, that Christianity is  
not Paganism. To the upright mind, every  
civil Dissent is a Paganism; and a disgrace of  
such a nature, as that every positive persecution,  
short of banishment or death, might seem pre-  
ferable. Nay, death itself, inflicted for mere  
reasons of Religion, would be less intolerable;  
it would be accounted honourable Martyrdom.  
But civil Dissent is accompanied with in-  
famy in this life, without being thrown

28 SE 60

## MODEST APOLOGY,

Æc.

**T**O write an Apology is always an arduous undertaking, because it always supposes precautions to be observed, and prejudices to be removed. Religious apologies are of all the most difficult to handle, because the prejudices of Religion are the strongest of all prejudices, and cannot bear to be touched but with the most delicate precaution. But to become, in a Protestant country, and at this day, the professed Apologist for what is termed POPERY, requires, if not superior talents, at least an uncommon degree of resolution : and, I confess, at this moment my heart beats with apprehension, and the quill trembles in my hand,

cus I                      B                      when



when I reflect that I am embarking in an enterprize, in which the interests of a whole body are concerned—and that, from the nature of the subject, and my own inability, I may possibly hurt that very cause which I have undertaken to defend.

But why then undertake it at all?—You might as well ask a dutiful child why he attempts to wipe off the unmerited ignominy that has been thrown upon a beloved parent. I was born and brought up in the bosom of the Catholic Church. She has ever been a kind and tender mother to me. I have received from her the most salutary instructions, and the most edifying examples. I see her daily insulted, misrepresented, calumniated; described as a force-refs, and depicted as a prostitute. I know the falsity of the charge. Is it surprising that I cry out as loud as I am able, “She is innocent! She is innocent! and merits not such abuse?” Were I as dumb as the son of Croesus\*, I should make an attempt to speak on such an occasion.

\* See Herodot. Clio, No. 85.

I am



I am very sensible that many of her children are more capable than I to do her that good office ; but none, it seems, are so willing : Not that some *Apologies*, or *Defences*, have not been made ; but, in my opinion, none were *modest Apologies* : they were rather tracts of illiberal controversy, and angry recrimination. Gother's *Papist Misrepresented*, &c. is the only exception I know of ; but it is not quite calculated for the present times ; nor is its bent the same with that of the present little work. I am far from thinking myself such an advocate as the cause deserves ; but the cause, I presume, will bear to be defended even by such an advocate as I am. I will not promise more than I hope to perform. If I be able to express myself in a plain and intelligible manner ; if my reasonings be clear, concise, and consequential ; if, in explaining the tenets of Catholics, I employ neither equivocation, nor reserve, nor subterfuge ; if I seek not industriously to conceal or excuse any abuse, to palliate or extenuate any crime, that may have been committed either by individuals

duals or whole societies of my communion ; if I meet every fair opponent on fair ground, and answer every plausible objection without evasion ; if, in fine, I keep always within the limits of an honest self-defence, and never indulge even a lawful retaliation—I flatter myself that moderate Protestants will deem me neither rash nor presumptuous ; will read me with patience, if not with pleasure ; and, however they may be inclined to think that I have failed in my attempt, will allow that I have merited no censure for making it.

Before I enter upon the subject, I must beg leave to make a few previous observations. And, first of all, in assuming the character of an Apologist for those of my persuasion, I mean not, in any respect, to justify the conduct of all those who have, in different times and countries, borne the name of Catholics ; and, under that name, have been often guilty of the most extravagant excesses. It is, indeed, hard that this premonition should be rendered necessary through the obstinacy of ungenerous adversaries,  
 who

who will continue to rake in the rotten sepulchres of our criminal ancestors for filth to throw at their innocent posterity, and to collect from the scandals and sacrileges of the Catholics of all ages a subject of impeachment against those of the present age. Of at least a hundred combatants, who have within these last twenty years declared themselves the champions of Protestantism, or rather the adversaries of Popery, I am perfectly safe to say, that there are not five who have not shot at us from that envenomed quiver; and I am sorry to be obliged to add that their shafts have too seldom missed their aim.

Yet surely nothing can be more illiberal and iniquitous. Æsop's wolf quarrelled with the poor lamb for the pretended crimes of his immediate father; but our more unreasonable persecutors would make us accountable back to the tenth generation. What, pray, have we of the eighteenth century to do with the ignorance of the ninth, the superstition of the twelfth, or the fanaticism of the sixteenth? Let who will



paint the phrensy of the Crusades, the horrors of the Valdensian Persecution, the fury of the French League, the barbarity of the Irish Massacre, and all the other commonplace topics of party declamation. As a lover of truth, I might be provoked to strip the piece of a part of its colouring, where I were convinced it was overcharged; but as a Christian and a Catholic, I am no further concerned, than seriously to lament, that ever there should have existed Christians and Catholics so forgetful of their own principles, as to act in diametrical opposition to them.

What need have we to be informed, by every pulpit rhetorician and polemical scribbler, that there have been haughty, imperious, domineering Popes; avaricious and simoniacal Bishops; dissolute and disorderly Monks; a licentious and libertine Clergy? Have not our own Bernards, and Bennos, and Gersons, and Guicciardinis, and Eadmers, and Ortuins described all that infamy, with equal accuracy, and much more eloquence? We read their invectives with  
astonishment

astonishment and indignation, we bewail the misfortune of those who lived in times of such corruption and depravity, and bless ourselves that Providence has cast our lot in better days; but we cannot be so unjust as to charge ourselves with crimes and abominations, in which neither we nor our fathers had any share.

Nor are we any more accountable for the large crops of spiritual cockle that have been, at different times, "while men slept," sown by the Enemy in the wide field of the Catholic world; and which, at certain periods, seem to have almost choked the good grain—I mean the enervation of antient Church Discipline; the fabrication of false Decretals; the multiplication of Appeals, Dispenses, Exemptions, Immunities and enormous Privileges; the rage of idle Pilgrimages; the base traffic of Indulgences; the propagation of lying Legends, feigned Miracles and apocryphal Revelations; the doctrines of the Pope's Infallibility, temporal Jurisdiction and deposing Power! All those tares have either

happily been rooted out by the vigilance of zealous Pastors, or, if there still remain some undergrowths,

..... *priscæ vestigia fraudis*

*Pauca* .....

they are, for the most part, such as it were, perhaps, better to leave till the last great harvest, when the divine Master will ordain of them according to his good pleasure.

Who will presume to say how much of a coarser substance may be worked up with the more costly materials that form the walls of the new Jerusalem, without impairing their strength or destroying their symmetry? The torch of critical Learning, that began to blaze about three hundred years ago, has well nigh consumed all "the hay and stubble," which had been mixed with the "silver and gold and precious stones" of the sanctuary: and if the jewels are not quite restored to their primitive lustre, it is in a great measure owing to the violence of the conflagration. Had the rubbish been done gradually away by the gentle sunshine of a rational Philosophy,

the



the operation would have been slower indeed, but much more effectual in the end.

—But Revolutions are rarely brought about by Philosophy.

I must also further declare, that I will not, in this Apology, pay the least attention to any arguments or objections drawn from the various opinions and decisions of our scholastic Divines or Casuists, against which any Catholic may argue as strongly as any Protestant, and for which, they only who defend them are responsible.

This will at once lop off from my subject a large portion of extraneous matter, with which it is not necessarily connected; and, by reducing the lines to a narrower compass, render the post I have taken more tenable against a desperate attack. And, indeed, who would encumber himself with any thing not absolutely necessary for his defence? much less with what might endanger his safety?

It would be hard, indeed, if I were obliged to defend and reconcile the jarring systems of Catholic theologues; Trans-  
alpine

alpine ideas of Papal despotism with the liberties of the Gallican Church and declarations of the Gallican Clergy, Thomists with Scotists, Rigorists with Probabilists, the Predetermination of the Dominicans with the Congruism of the Jesuits, Bellarmine with Barclay, Flavigny with Morinus, Knott with Petrus Aurelius, Parsons with Witherington, &c.

I repeat it, then ; I will have nothing to do with all that. My business is to defend, or, if ye will, excuse the real and confessed Principles of the Catholic Religion, which were at all times, and in all places, the indisputable Principles of Catholics, which every Catholic will acknowledge, and which no Catholic can reasonably deny.—

This is precisely the object of my Apology.

With regard to the application and remote practical consequences of those principles, I confine myself to a still narrower sphere. The belief and practice of the British Catholics are my more immediate concern ; and it is the belief and practice of British Catholics only that I wish to justify,

enique

But

But are British Catholics, then, to be considered as a distinct denomination from the rest? And are their belief and practice different from the belief and practice of those who, in other countries, bear the same name? With a proper distinction, I make no hesitation to answer both questions in the affirmative. The Catholics of Great Britain have the same general Creed with the Catholics of other nations; they believe from the same motives of credibility; they admit the same terms of communion; but, in the particular application of all these, and more especially in the application and explanation of their remote consequences, the British Catholics differ, and have always differed, from all other Catholics.

The reason is obvious. The religious tenets of a people will always favour of their political principles, and to these they will ever be more or less accommodated. From the same Gospel and the same Faith, the Italian shall deduce arguments in favour of maxims acknowledged and applauded



plauded in Italy, which the German shall disavow and proscribe; the Spaniard and Portuguese shall see the lawfulness and expediency of an Inquisition, which the Frenchman shall condemn and abhor; the Pole shall panegyryze a despotic Aristocracy, which a Swiss shall consider as the most insupportable of all Tyrannies; and the Venetian shall be jealous of, and proscribe from the beginning, a Religious Order, which all the other Catholic Powers of Europe shall patronise and cherish for more than two hundred years.

But if among Nations inhabiting the same continent, often the same climate, sometimes the same soil, there is such a diversity of sentiment with regard to the application of the same religious principles; what is it likely to be, when a very great difference of climate, soil and situation concur to render the opposition more sensible and the contrast more striking?

Now this is precisely the case of Great Britain. Disjoined from the rest of Europe by that element which naturally inspires all

Islanders

Islanders with high notions of self-importance; and blessed with that rare and equally proportioned intermixture of heat and cold, hill and dale, wood and water, verdure and corn-fields, that makes men healthful, vigorous, and active, She has, as a natural consequence of those blessings, always cultivated and maintained a peculiar species of both civil and religious *Liberty*, unknown, till of late, to any other nation in the world; and in spite of the numerous revolutions She has undergone, and the various efforts that have at different periods been made to eradicate the precious plant, yet still it has grown, and still it has prospered.—And may it continue to prosper to the end of time!

It was the remark of Addison, who, yet, was not without his prejudices, that the Catholics of his time were not the Catholics of the age before; and that English Catholics in particular were in many respects different from their brethren abroad. He ascribes it, indeed, to their liv-

ing among Protestants\*, and I do not deny that some share of the difference is to be placed to that account ; but I add that the difference was as real, though perhaps not so conspicuous, at times when no Protestant existed ; and that we are chiefly to seek its cause in the original frame of our nature and constitution, which will ever be British, in any system of Religion and under any form of Government whatsoever.

I shall have another occasion to establish this position, on what I deem the most irre-

\* “ As it is certain, there has been a kind of secret reformation made, though not publicly avowed, in the Roman Catholic Church, since the spreading of the Protestant Religion ; so we find that the several nations are recovered out of their ignorance, in proportion as they converse more or less with those of the Reformed Churches. For this reason, the French are much more enlightened than the Spaniards or Italians, on account of their frequent controversies with the Huguenots : and we find many of the Roman Catholic gentlemen of our own country, who will not stick to laugh at the superstitions they meet with in other nations.” *Remarks on several Parts of Italy*, p. 150.

fragable



fragable testimony ; that of *well-evidenced* historical facts.— At present, I proceed to my Apology, after having once more declared that it is an Apology for the Principles and Practice of the Roman Catholics of Great Britain, and of them only\*.

I shall divide my subject into three Sections. In the first, I shall lay before the Reader those Articles of Catholic Belief, about which there is, or ought to be, no dispute ; because they are Articles in which we are perfectly agreed with all Protestants ; and it will appear, I apprehend, that those Articles are much more numerous and important than it is generally imagined ; at least than pragmatistical fomenters of division are willing to have it known.

In the second Section, I shall mark more particularly the points in which we are either perfectly agreed, or nearly coincide, with some one or other Protestant commu-

\* I would not, however, be understood to insinuate that the Irish Catholics are of a different complexion. I trust their ideas of civil and religious Rights are much the same with ours.

nion; especially with the established Church of England.

In the third Section, I shall fairly and candidly sum up all the tenets that are peculiar to Catholics; ascertain what is certain, remove what is doubtful, and determine the strict sense in which a British Catholic receives them: and, which is the principal part of this undertaking, defend, or apologize for, those tenets, the best I can; and endeavour to show that they merit neither proscription nor persecution, nor even the privation of a single privilege that other Britons enjoy.

## SECTION I.

*Articles of religious Belief, in which we  
are agreed with all Protestants.*

**BY** *all Protestants*, the intelligent reader will easily suppose, that I mean only all such Bodies of Protestants as have assumed the form of something like a National Church ; and have, in that capacity, published their respective Professions of Faith. To extend the comparison to the creed of every clancular Association or obscure Conventicle, would be an endless as well as an unnecessary labour.

The four principal Denominations are, the *Church of England*, the *Lutherans*, the *Calvinists*, and the *Socinians*. They are not here ranked according to the strict priority of time, but according to the gradual distances at which they stand from us. Their Doctrines I have faithfully collected from the avowed Creeds and Canons of their  
c Synods,



Synods, Convocations, Assemblies; from their Catechisms, and Confessions of Faith, and whatever else they acknowledge as standards of their peculiar Beliefs.

Now, from a diligent and, I trust, impartial examination of their different Doctrines, I think myself fully authorized to affirm that they are ALL perfectly agreed with us in the following important and comprehensive points of Christian Faith. And

I. We ALL believe, as a previous and fundamental Article, that there is One, and only One, Supreme, Self-existent, Eternal Being, whom we call God, of infinite power, wisdom, veracity, justice, mercy and goodness, the Creator, Conserver, Sovereign Lord of all things visible and invisible; our first beginning and last end, in whom we move, live, and have our existence.

II. That this God has, at different times, and in various manners, been pleased to reveal his will to Mankind; and that the

history of those revelations is found in the Books of the Old and New Testaments, which we all hold to have been, in some sense or other\*, divinely inspired, and to contain an authentic history of the origin, either explicitly or implicitly, of all that is necessary to be believed and practised in order to arrive at the happiness which they hold forth to us.

III. From those sacred Books we learn, and all believe, that Man was created innocent, righteous and holy, according to the Image and Likeness of God ; capable of meriting rewards, or of deserving punishment, according to the good or bad use he should make of his free will ; and blessed with every sort of temporal happiness compatible with his probationary state : But that, having fallen from that state by a positive

\* I have said, " in some sense or other ;" because I know there have been warm debates among the Theologians of all Communions about the nature, extent and qualities of Inspiration. — I wish to avoid giving the least occasion for cavil.

and voluntary disobedience, he was, in consequence, stripped of his present privileges, and condemned to future ignominy, labour, pain and death ; though not without encouragement to hope for a Redeemer, who should one day repair the breach made by his transgression, heal the wounds of his corrupted nature, and restore him, on certain terms, to his primitively intended bliss\*.

IV. That, in the mean time, to prepare the way for that great event, and to preserve uninterrupted the chain of Religion, God was bountifully pleased to raise up, in every age, some just and holy men, to whom he communicated such temporary and local precepts, as he deemed the most proper to answer his wise purposes ; and, at length, through the mediation of Moses, gave a written Law to a whole People, whom he made the Depositories

\* Perhaps some part of this paragraph may be objected to by Socinians ; yet it does not appear to be irreconcilable with their principles.



of the true Faith ; and among whom, in due time, his greatest and last Envoy, the MESSIAH and SAVIOUR, was to appear.

V. That this divine Envoy, so often promised and so ardently expected ; prefigured by so many legal types, and pre-announced by so many express predictions, was, in the fullness of time and in the person of JESUS CHRIST, conceived and born of a Virgin through the power of the Holy Ghost \* ; preached in Judæa, suffered an ignominious death, was buried, and arose again on the third day ; conversed forty days with his Disciples, founded a Church that was to embrace all nations and endure to the end of time ; ascended into heaven, where he sitteth at the right hand of God, and will come again at the last day to judge all mankind according to their deeds ; when the good shall be received into reserved bliss, and the bad condemned to deserved punishment.

VI. That the terms on which the fol-

\* They who reject the first chapters of St. Matthew, and the first chapter of Luke, will also object to this.

lowers of Christ are entitled to the benefits of his redemption, and the promises of his Gospel, are, to believe all that he hath taught, and to practise all that he hath commanded.

This, I presume, is the most simple and comprehensive idea that can be given of Christianity; a Confession of Faith to which Christians of all denominations will have little or no difficulty to subscribe; which some of them will probably consider as containing all that is necessary to be believed; and which in reality doth contain the great fundamentals of Christianity.

If, therefore, we Roman Catholics hold all these points, it evidently follows that we hold, by the concession of Protestants themselves, the whole essence of Christianity; and, consequently, that whatever Articles we may have superadded to this general Creed, cannot, on Protestant principles, be condemned by Protestants—unless they can be shown to be inconsistent with any of the above fundamental Articles about which we are all agreed.

The

The fairness of this inference can hardly be disputed. But it may, possibly, be said :  
 “ Is it really true that Catholics do believe  
 “ all those fundamental Articles of Chris-  
 “ tianity ? And is there nothing in their  
 “ additional *Credenda* that is repugnant to  
 “ those Articles ? ”

The first of these questions may seem strange, and even injurious, to such well-informed Protestant Readers as have made it their study to be thoroughly acquainted with our real tenets. But that the number of such is, comparatively, few, we have but too good reason to infer not only from the Grub-street libels (the ephemeral spawn of ignorance, fanaticism and malevolence) that are disseminated among the Vulgar with so much industry, and swallowed with so much avidity ; but even from the works of sober, sage and respectable men ; from whom we might look for better treatment.

When we read in such anonymous pamphlets as *The Protestant's Resolution*, *The Dumfries Catechism*, *Appeal from the*  
 C 4 *Protestant*



*Protestant Association, Strictures on the State of Roman Catholics, &c. &c. &c.* the descriptions of our Doctrine, replete with calumny and misrepresentation; we are not at all amazed; because we have been long accustomed to hear the same sing-song from writers of that illiberal class: We pity and despise them. But when names that do honour to the age, and are ornaments of the nation, permit themselves to be so far carried away by the stream of prejudice, as to disfigure our tenets in order to expose them,—it is hard, it is passing hard, on such occasions not to feel other emotions than bare astonishment.

Yet what can we do but persevere in denying the charge, and repeat and repeat, that we firmly hold the same great fundamental Articles of Christianity, that are believed to be such by Protestants\*?

\* This hath been granted by the candid and moderate of the Protestant Party. "They (the Papists) says Daillé, believe all that we believe; but we do not believe all that they believe." See also Grotius—Thorndyke—Taylor, &c.

But

But perhaps we hold other tenets incompatible with this belief, and destroy with one hand what we build by another? In answer to this question, I affirm we do not; and I content myself with this affirmation, until the contrary be evidently shown me. I say, evidently: for it is not enough, that a captious and cavilling controvertist pretend to prove, by remote and far-fetched consequences, the incompatibility of any two of our tenets. As long as we deny those consequences, they cannot with any justice be urged against us.

I beg leave to illustrate this by an example or two taken from the Doctrines of Protestants. The Lutheran Doctrine concerning the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper, implies, in the opinion of many Calvinists as well as Catholics, a denial of the humanity of Jesus Christ: Yet the French Calvinists in their National Synod of Charenton admit the Lutherans to their communion, "because they agree in the principal and fundamental points of Religion." — "And it would be calumny," says Daillé  
in

in his Letter to Morglat, “ to impute to  
 “ them a consequence which they formal-  
 “ ly deny; however clearly it may seem  
 “ deducible from their Doctrine.”

On the other side, the Calvinistical idea of absolute Predestination has appeared to most Catholics, to many Protestants, and even to some Calvinists, to involve these shocking consequences—That God is the author of sin—and that all his promises and comminations are useless and illusory. Yet it would be unjust to ascribe such impious tenets to the most rigid Gomarist, as long as he positively denies them to be a part of his belief.

In like manner, although the thirty-seventh of the English *Articles of Religion*, which gives “ to the King’s Majesty the  
 “ chief government of all estates of this  
 “ realm, whether they be ecclesiastical or  
 “ civil,” may appear at first sight incompatible with the headship of Christ, and an usurpation of the spiritual powers left by him to the Apostles, and their successors in the ministry; yet it is highly unfair to  
 charge



charge the Church of England with such a consequence, (as most of our polemical writers indiscreetly do) seeing it is clearly disclaimed in the addition to that article made in the reign of Elizabeth; and the disclaim publicly "testified" in *injunctions*, by her "set forth."

But is it not equally unfair to draw for us, from some of our peculiar tenets (the invocation of Saints, for instance, the veneration of the Cross, the adoration of the Eucharist, &c.) consequences which, we maintain, can never be fairly deduced; and which, at any rate, we positively reject?

To deny to a community, or an individual, the right of explaining his own sentiments, when they are liable to be misunderstood, is a species of tyranny that hath, I fear, been too often exercised, in all communions; but it is not, for that, a less detestable tyranny. To tell me that I *must* draw such a conclusion from such premises, when I am perfectly conscious, that it cannot be drawn; is much the same, as to  
compel

compel me to own that I see a mountain, when I can perceive only a pitiful mole-hill.

Taking it for granted, then, that no unreasonable opponent will henceforth urge against us the incompatibility of our tenets, one with another, I resume my subject, and repeat ; That, since we believe, with the Protestants, the fundamental Articles of Christianity, it is hard, that for believing a few additional ones, which we deem perfectly compatible with the former, we should therefore be excluded from the civil rights of Christian society. The Saviour often reproached his disciples for having too " little faith ;" we are reproached and persecuted for having too much !

But if a redundant belief be an object of proscription, I see not how Protestants themselves can escape. The Calvinist finds an excess of credulity in the Lutheran, the Presbyterian in the High-churchman, and the Socinian in all the four : and, unquestionably, all the four have, in their respective creeds, additional articles which,

184003

in

in the idea of a Socinian, must appear infinitely more repugnant to the fundamental Articles of Christianity, than any of our additional Articles in respect to theirs. Transubstantiation itself, as I understand it, seems a *gnat*, compared to the *camel* of a Trinity.



## SECTION II.

*Of other Points of Doctrine and Discipline,  
in which we Roman Catholics are agreed  
with, at least, some Denomination of Pro-  
testants.*

HAVING, in the preceding Section, detailed those Articles of Credence in which we, in general, accord with Christians, even with Protestant Christians, of all denominations; let us next take a view of those which we hold in common with, at least, some one denomination of Protestants; and which, although not of such magnitude and importance as the former, are yet so many additional links to that chain of union, which every sober and serious Christian should wish to see extended as far as possible, instead of taking a malignant pleasure in diminishing its length. The thinner and weaker the wall of separation, that unhappily divides us, the  
more

more easily and readily it may be pulled down : and he who can pick out but a single stone or brick merits the thanks of all those who wish to see it demolished. But as long as the pragmatic workmen on each side vie one with another who shall throw most rubbish in the way, and are constantly adding new buttresses and bulwarks to support and strengthen the barrier, there can be little hopes of approximation.

The Church of England is allowed to be a respectable Church. She has always kept up a degree of dignity and decorum, which no other Protestant communion has been able or willing to retain.—Let us try, then, how much nearer, through her medium, we can still bring ourselves to Protestants, or, which is the same thing, how much nearer we can bring Protestants to us.

With the Church of England we are perfectly agreed in the doctrines of the Trinity, of the incarnation of the Word, of the sufferings, death, and mediatorship of Jesus Christ, and of the personality and efficacy

efficacy of the Holy Ghost.—In a word, we, with the Church of England, receive, and publicly recite, the *three* creeds, in the same form and equivalent terms\*.

With the Church of England, we also believe that “the visible Church of Christ  
“is a congregation of faithful men, in  
“which the pure word of God is preached,  
“and the sacraments duly administered,  
“according to Christ’s ordinance, in all  
“those things that of necessity are requi-  
“site to the same†.”—That this “Church  
“hath power to decree rites and ceremo-  
“nies, and authority in controversies of  
“Faith; yet so, that it is not lawful for  
“her to ordain any thing that is contrary  
“to God’s word‡.”—And that “every Na-  
“tional Church hath authority to ordain,  
“change, and abolish Church rites or ce-  
“remonies, ordained only by man’s autho-  
“rity; so that all things be done to edi-  
“fication§.”

With the Church of England, we admit

\* Articles of Religion, Art. 3.

† Art. 19.

‡ Art. 20.

§ Art. 34.



a Spiritual Hierarchy, consisting of Bishops, Priests and Deacons: and we believe that it “is not lawful for any man to assume those “offices, before he be lawfully called and “sent; and who is not chosen and called by “men who have public authority—to call “and send ministers into the Lord’s vine- “yard\*,”—and that “although the evil “have, sometimes, chief authority in the “ministrations of the Word and Sacra- “ments; yet, forasmuch as they do not “the same in their own name, but in “Christ’s—we may use their ministry both “in hearing the word of God and receiv- “ing the sacraments†.”

With the same Church of England, we hold that “the Sacraments ordained by “Christ are not only badges or tokens of “Christian men’s profession; but rather sure “witnesses, and effectual signs of grace‡”— That “Baptism is (accordingly) not only “a sign of profession and mark of differ- “ence, whereby Christians are discerned “from others that are not christened; but is

\* Art. 23. † Art. 26. ‡ Art. 25.

“also a sign of regeneration or new birth;  
 “whereby, as by an instrument, they, that  
 “receive baptism rightly, are grafted into  
 “the Church, and adopted to be children  
 “of God\*”—and that “the Supper of the  
 “Lord is not only a sign of the love that  
 “Christians ought to have among them-  
 “selves one to another; but rather it is a  
 “sacrament of our redemption by Christ’s  
 “death, insomuch that, to such as rightly  
 “and worthily receive the same, the bread  
 “which we break is a partaking of the  
 “body of Christ, and the cup of blessing is  
 “a partaking of the blood of Christ”—  
 “which body and blood of Christ are veri-  
 “ly and indeed taken and received by the  
 “faithful in the Lord’s Supper †.”

With the Church of England, we ac-  
 knowledge the utility and expediency of set  
 forms of prayer, or a public Liturgy;  
 and moreover allow, that as “there was  
 “never any thing by the wit of man so  
 “well devised, or so sure established, which,  
 “in continuance of time, hath not been

\* Art. 27. † Art 28, and Catechism.

“ liable to be corrupted\*, it is but reason-  
 “ able that, upon weighty and important  
 “ considerations, according to the various  
 “ exigency of times and occasions, such  
 “ change and alterations should be made  
 “ therein, as to those that are in place of  
 “ authority should from time to time seem  
 “ either necessary or expedient †.”

With the Church of England, we are, in the very form of our Liturgy, so much agreed; or, to speak more properly, the Liturgy of the Church of England is so nearly a copy of ours; that, with very little variation, the one might be substituted for the other. When I run over *Tables and Rules for the moveable and immoveable Feasts, &c.* and find in them the same commencement and œconomy of the Ecclesiastical year—the same, or rather a much better, distribution of the Psalms and other books of Scripture—the same, or a similar, Kalendar of Feasts and Fasts—the same Terms of *Advent, Lent, Septuagesima, Easter, Whitsunday, &c.*—the same *Collects, Epistles, and Gospels*; and nearly the same mode of ad-

\* Concerning the Service of the Church. † The Preface,



ministering the Sacraments; I, in a great measure, recognize the Roman Catholic Liturgy, before it had lost its pristine simplicity, by modern interpolation and new-modelling.—But of this more hereafter, in its proper place.

Our Ecclesiastic Polity was the platform on which that of the Church of England's was laid—Our Canon Law is still, in a great measure, the Rule of her Judicatories.—She has her Spiritual Consistorial Courts, her Decrees, her Censures, from us.—She has her subordinate Church Government, her Primates, her Prelates, her Archbishops and Bishops, her Deans, Prebendaries, Canons, and other Dignitaries; her Dioceses, Parishes, Cathedrals, and common Churches; her Benefices, her Tythes, her Perquisites, her Easter Dues and Free-will Offerings; her very Surplices, Lawn-sleeves and Mitres—all from us. In these respects we are so resemblant, that other Protestant Sects consider us as two Sisters of the same family; which, like Ovid's Sea-nymphs, have somewhat different traits of countenance, but not dissimilar

similar faces\* ; and on this account abuse them both alike.

But is it not rather strange that one of these sisters, and the younger too, after having stript her elder of the best of her jewels and the richest of her ornaments, should abhor, hoot, and persecute her, for claiming her right of primogeniture?—Be it allowed, that the old lady has deeper wrinkles, and more withered limbs—let it be granted that her complexion is not so fresh, her shape not so comely, her gait not quite so simple, and her manners less genteel ; are these sufficient reasons to treat her like a strumpet, and kick her ignominiously out of doors? The more antiquated, ugly, and disfigured she may appear to be, the greater claim, one would think, she has to pity and generous indulgence. Who knows, but that by a kinder treatment, and a seasonable application of lenitives, she might not gradually recover some little share of her pristine

..... *Facies non omnibus una,  
Nec diversa tamen, qualem decet esse sororum.*

vigour and beauty ; be less morose, less superstitious, less obstinate, and much more charitable in her disposition ; and, at length, get quit of all her oddities (for, like all other old matrons, oddities she has) and of her inveterate habits, which she has been contracting during a course of 1400 years at least ?—Sure I am, that an opposite conduct will never produce so desirable an effect.

Meanwhile, let us see what peculiarities she has contracted, during that period, which preclude her unlucky children from many of the social and civil advantages, enjoyed in their extent by the more fortunate darlings of her younger sister ; and even by those whom her younger sister herself avows not as her legitimate offspring ; I mean the Protestant Dissenters from the Church of England.

Dropping metaphor, let us seriously examine, what are the real, or apparent, differences, which actually subsist between the English Roman Catholics and the Protestants of the Established Church of England.

The



The first difference, that presents itself to view, is,

# WHAT IS THE RULE OF FAITH?

THIS may be called a preliminary question; and I know not, if any question has been more often agitated, and more keenly controverted. Yet I have small hesitation in affirming, that all that has been said, or written, on the subject is little more than a mere logomachy—one of those controversies, which, to use an expression of Hooker's, "if one were willing to learn, might have died the very day in which they were brought forth."

At first sight indeed, and in the earliest period of the debate, the difference between the disputants seemed great and irreconcilable. Tradition only (said the Romanist) is the Rule of Faith.—No; (replied the Protestant) Scripture, Scripture only, is the Rule of Faith.—Scripture only (said the Romanist) cannot be the Rule of Faith, because Scripture is a dead letter, which cannot explain itself; a nose of wax, which

may be moulded into any form; and, therefore, nothing but Tradition, oral and universal Tradition, or the concatenated testimony of a successive Church, can be a certain and perpetual Rule of Faith.

The Protestant, on the other hand, as warmly contended, that Tradition, and oral Testimony, were the most uncertain of all Rules; because they are liable to be weakened by the authority of false teachers, by enthusiasm, by pretences to a different and more secret tradition, by too great a veneration for the Clergy, by implicit faith in the decrees of Rome, &c. &c.—The Roman Catholics replied, that the Scriptures, as a Rule of Faith, were subject to much the same, or to greater inconveniences. They might be corrupted, interpolated, misunderstood, and misinterpreted; and applied to support every novel heresy, which human pride, or human folly, might happen to broach.

Such, at its commencement, was the state of the controversy. But, when both parties began to reconsider more coolly the  
force

force of their own arguments, and of the adversary's objections, they found it expedient to abate their first positiveness, and to make a sort of reciprocal composition. The rational Catholic saw, that he could not well support his absolute Tradition without the aid of Scripture; and the rational Protestant perceived, that he could not well ascertain his Scripture without the help of Tradition.—New, and more tenable positions were therefore taken by both; and, although hostilities were still continued, great mutual concessions were made by the manly and liberal of the respective combatants. The Catholic language now was, that the *Word of God*, written or unwritten; that is, *Scripture* and *Tradition*, were together the Rule of Faith: whilst the Protestant, still contending for Scripture alone as the only Rule, yet acknowledged that the authority of primitive and universal Tradition was necessary to prove the authenticity of that Rule. “Scripture (says Stillingsfleet) is “owned to be *our* Rule; and universal  
 “Tradition



“ Tradition the evidence on which we  
 “ receive the Books \*.” In nearly the  
 same manner reason all the Church-of-  
 England’s writers on, what is called,  
 the *Popish Controversy*, in the reigns of  
 Charles II. and of James II.

Thus the whole controverted question  
 was, at length, reduced to a mere question  
 of fact. Both parties were agreed that the  
*Word of God* alone was the *Rule of Faith*;  
 only the one held that *all* of that word has  
 been written in the books of the Old and  
 New Testaments; the other, that some  
 part of it has been handed down, from the  
 Apostles’ days, by oral testimony.

Nay, further, as, on the one hand, there  
 have not been wanting Roman Catholic  
 Theologians, particularly of the Sorbonnic  
 school, who have freely confessed, that  
 every fundamental Article of Faith is, ei-  
 ther expressly or implicitly, contained in  
 the written Word; so, on the other hand,  
 there have been Protestant Theologians  
 willing to grant, that every Article of

\* Answer to Sergeant’s *Catholic Letters*, p. 16.

FOURTH I “ Faith

Faith is not so clearly and explicitly revealed in the written Word, as not to stand in need of Apostolical Tradition as a secondary support : and hence, no doubt, it is that so many volumes have been written by Protestants, and especially by Protestants of the Church of England, to prove that Tradition, universal Tradition, is on the side of Protestantism.

For my own part, I deem the whole controversy of very little importance ; at least in as far as the belief of Catholics and Protestants is the same. For, what signifies it, what are the motives of believing, if both believe alike ? For example, if I, with St. Austin, believe the Gospels on the authority of the Catholic or Universal Church ; and another believe the same Gospels on their own intrinsic evidence, or on the impulse of God's Spirit moving him thereto, or on any other similar or dissimilar motive ; still all would be sound believers. For belief is nothing more than a full *assent of the mind*, whencesoever that assent is produced : and wherever that  
assent

assent exists, there cannot exist incredulity. I beg leave, then, to discharge this controversy, and to proceed to another nearly connected with it; I mean

OF THE JUDGE OF RELIGIOUS CONTROVERSIES.

THIS, too, to me appears only a war of words. For those Protestants, who in theory maintain, That the Bible is both the *Rule of Faith* and the *Judge of Controversies*, are sadly puzzled, when they have occasion to put their theory in practice; and are obliged, as well as the Catholics, to have recourse to Church-decisions, when they deal with Dissenters from their established credence.

Indeed, if we take a retrospective view of all the religious controversies which have been agitated in the Christian Church since its first foundation; we shall not find a single one ultimately decided, but by the voice of a living judge.

When great dissensions arose, at Antioch, about the necessity of circumcising the



the Gentile converts to Christianity ; the Jewish converts affirming, that unless the former were “ circumcised after the manner of Moses, they could not be saved : ” did Paul and Barnabas appeal to Scripture ? No ; it was “ determined that Paul and Barnabas, and certain other of them, should go up to Jerusalem, unto the Apostles, and Elders, about this question \*.”—“ And the Apostles and Elders came together, for to consider of this matter.”—What was the issue ? After “ much disputing,” it was resolved by the Apostles and Elders, with the whole Church, that letters should be sent to the Christians of Antioch, declaring that circumcision was unnecessary ; and that it was enough for them to abstain “ from meats offered to idols, and from blood, and from things strangled, and from fornication †.”

It will be said, perhaps, that this example is not to the purpose ; because the Apostles were inspired and infallible : and, therefore, their decisions were equal to Scripture ; or, rather, were a part of Scripture.

\* Acts xv. 2.

† Ib. ver. 29.

But if this were the case, why did not Paul himself, who was certainly as much inspired and as infallible as the other Apostles, decide the question all at once without going to Jerusalem to consult his colleagues there? Why was an Assembly convoked to argue the matter? Why was the subject debated with "much disputing?" And why is their decision written in the name of the Apostles, Elders, and the whole Church?—Every circumstance shows, that the Apostles, on this occasion, were guided by the common rules of common Judicatories. They debate, opine, and determine, as all Synods have since done; no doubt, by a majority of suffrages.

But, setting aside this instance, if you will, let us descend to latter times; and observe how the most important religious controversies have been decided in every age since the days of the Apostles: when inspiration and infallibility are both supposed to have no more existed.

One of the greatest controversies which ever disturbed Christianity, was that concerning the *Divinity* of Jesus Christ. How

was

was it ultimately decided? Not by Scripture: for both parties equally appealed to it; and, in my humble opinion, the Arians brought more plausible arguments from that repository than the Athanasians. Nor was the question decided by Tradition: for both quoted the earlier Christian Writers, as favourable to themselves; and it must be confessed, I think, that the Antenicene Fathers are, at most, ambiguous witnesses.—How then was the question, at length, resolved? Why, by a majority of suffrages in a Council of 318 Bishops; by whom the *Consubstantiality* of the SON with the FATHER was declared to be an Article of Christian Faith: and this Article of Christian Faith makes a part, a principal part, of the Protestant, as well as of the Catholic Creed. In the Protestant Church of England, in particular, the Creed of Nice is as much a standard of belief as in the Church of Rome; and is publicly recited in the Liturgies of both.

I know it has been said, that the Church of  
England



England receives the Article of *Consubstantiation* and the other Articles contained in the Nicene Creed, not on the authority of the Nicene, or any other Council, but because they are Scripture doctrines. But is not this evidently begging the question? Many Protestants, and these not the least learned, find no such doctrine as *Consubstantiation* in the Scriptures; and the whole body of ancient Arians, who once divided the Christian world, affirmed that no such doctrine could be proved from Scripture. — Scripture, then, cannot be a decisive Judge of controverted points: and some other tribunal must be sought, if a decision is to be made in matters of religious controversy.

Whether such decisions have always been just decisions, is no part of my present inquiry. I believe that many of them have been the fruit of partiality and prejudice. I wish only to show, that never was any controversy, about either *Faith* or *Discipline*, terminated by Scripture. Scripture may be called the *Rule*, but the application of

that Rule must be made by something else than Scripture; whether that something be *private judgment*, or *public authority*. Scripture may be the *Law*, but cannot expound itself. Was ever any Legislative Act so accurately worded, as to preclude all future doubt and litigation? I believe, not. How then should we expect, that even the Scripture is exempted from the common lot of all other written documents?

Yes (says some staunch Scripturist), the Scripture can expound itself. Have we not *self-interpreting Bibles*, in various forms and languages?—We have self-interpreting Bibles—but what purpose do they serve? Did they ever yet decide a single controversy? or confute a single heretic? I know of no heresy, nor of no controversy, that ever arose, even among Protestants, which was decided by a self-interpreting Bible; or, indeed, by any other authority than Church-authority; even among those Protestant sects who speak the loudest in favour of Scripture-authority.—Of this we have a notable instance in the case of Arminius. Was his

Doctrine judged and condemned by the Bible? The Gomarists alleged, indeed, that his Doctrine was incompatible with the Doctrine of the Bible; but the Arminians affirmed the contrary. An appeal was, therefore, made, not to the Bible, but to the Synod of Dort; and the Synod of Dort judged and condemned Arminianism with all the dictatorialness of a Papal Consistory or a Popish Council. How far, in so acting, the Synod of Dort departed from Protestant principles, let others say: but certain it is, that not the Bible, but the Synod of Dort, was the Judge in this controversy: and it is equally certain that the Catholics took occasion from this decision to reproach the Calvinists with inconsistency\*. In truth, I cannot well conceive how

\* A French writer (Pluquet) makes the following remark on the conduct of the Synod of Dort: "Les Calvinistes n'ont point de principes à l'épreuve des difficultés et des rétorsions des Arminiens. Il n'appartient qu'aux Catholiques de réfuter solidement et sans retour l'Arminien, en lui prouvant que c'est à l'Eglise qu'il appartient d'interpréter l'Ecriture, et  
" de



how any *Confession*, or *Profession*, of Faith, *Creed* or *Catechism* of any kind, could be imposed on the members of any Society as a test of Orthodoxy, if the imposers did not consider themselves as competent and lawful Judges.

The acute Author of the Confessional has, indeed, I think, pretty clearly proved, that this is not agreeable to the first Principles of Protestantism, or to the right of private judgment in the interpretation of Scripture: but he has as clearly shown that the Church of England claims the full power of requiring obedience and subscription to *her own sense* of Holy Scripture. But, as I am here acting the part of a modest Apologist, not that of a keen Controvertist, I will not meddle in the matter of debate between that writer and his antagonists. I only repeat, that the Roman Catholic tenet, *That the Church, not the*

*"de nous apprendre ce que Jésus-Christ a révélé."*

The Protestant reader will doubtless smile at this vaunting language. And so he may for me; I only quote it as an example of the manner, in which the Romanists managed the controversy.

*Bible, is the ultimate Judge in religious controversies,* is, if repugnant to the principles, certainly not to the practice, of Protestant Churches.—The next question in debate is,

IS THE CHURCH AN INFALLIBLE JUDGE ?

“ She is,” say the Catholics.—“ She is “not,” say the Protestants. Hence the difference here is, apparently, great indeed. But let us see, whether it may not admit of some modification. Immunity from error is so high a privilege, that we have difficulty to ascribe it to any human being, or set of human beings, howsoever eminent their rank, or exalted their station : and, to tell the truth, it is no easy matter to prove that even the Church, at least that any particular Church, is infallible, in her judgments and decisions. The arguments adduced by our Theologians in support of his Article, although in gross apparently strong, yet in detail are not irrefragable. They are of two sorts : Scripture Proofs, and Proofs of Consonance.

The former may be summed up in a  
single

single sentence. The Church of Christ is "the pillar and ground of the truth \*;" against which Christ has promised that "the gates of Hell shall not prevail †;" that "the spirit of truth will guide her teachers into 'all truth ‡;" and that himself will be "with them unto the end of the world §."—I would ask any unbiassed Protestant, if this be not a very plausible argument.

The common answer is, That the above Scripture-texts have been misunderstood and mis-explained; and that they admit, nay require, a different meaning. "This cannot be, (replies the Catholic) since the Church, which is infallible, has so explained them."—"But, (rejoins the Protestant,) you here get into a vicious circle: you first prove the Church's Infallibility by ambiguous texts of Scripture, and then fix the meaning of those texts by the supposed Infallibility of the Church!"—I would ask any unbiassed Catholic, if this be not a plausible rejoinder?

\* 1 Tim. iii. 15. † Matt. xvi. 18. ‡ Compare John xiv. 6. xv. 26. xvi. 13. § Matt. xxviii. 20.



Nor is this the only difficulty with which our Theologians have to struggle. For, should it be granted, that the whole Church of Christ, that is, the aggregate of all Christians, is in some sense *infallible*, or, to speak perhaps more properly, *indefectible*; it by no means follows, that any particular Church, or partial collection of particular Churches, is that indefectible Catholic Church, *against which the gates of Hell shall not prevail.*

Thus, neither the particular Church of Jerusalem, although "the mother of all the Churches\*;" nor the Church of Antioch, nor the Church of Alexandria, nor the Church of Ephesus, nor the Church of Cesarea, nor the Church of Carthage, nor the Church of Toledo, nor the Church of Arles, nor the Church of Lyons, nor the Church of Milan, nor the Church of Aquileia, nor the Church of Constantinople, nor the Church of Rome,

\* Της δὲ γε ΜΗΤΡΟΣ ἁπασων των ἐκκλησιων της εν Ιερο-  
σολυμοις. Epist. Concil. Constantinop. ad Damasum, &c.  
apud Labbe, tom. ii. p. 966. "In Jerusalem primum  
"fundata Ecclesia, totius orbis Ecclesias seminavit."  
Hieron. in cap. 2. Isa. tom. iii. p. 23. ed. Bened.

(although

(although most of them are called by antiquity Apostolical Sees) can, with any sort of propriety, be called the *Catholic Church*: nor can the united Churches of Palestine, or of Egypt, or of Asia Minor, or of Africa, or of Spain, or of the Gauls, or of Italy, be, separately and exclusively, denominated the *Catholic Church*. They may all form so many parts of the Catholic Church: but still none of them have an exclusive right to the title *Catholic*.

What then is the Catholic Church? Perhaps, the best definition, at least the shortest that can be given, is that of our countryman, the venerable Bede: "The Church is the Congregation of all the Saints \*."—But no one has so fully defined the term as Valafridus Strabo: "The Church (*Ecclesia*)," says he, "is a Greek noun, and may be interpreted a Convocation or Convention; and is either a general union of the Saints, in one faith and love; hence it is called one and

\* "*Ecclesia, quæ est Sanctorum omnium Congregatio, pro eterna sibi in Domino stabilitate, columna et fundamentum veritatis dicitur.*"

“ *Catholic*—or a holy society of particular  
 “ places ; and in this sense there are many  
 “ Churches—and, lastly, the house in  
 “ which a multitude of the faithful con-  
 “ vene to be taught, or to celebrate divine  
 “ things, is likewise called a Church\*.”—

Here we have an accurate description of all the different acceptations in which the word Church can be taken ; but the first only is that with which we are now concerned.

Similar definitions are given by the Fathers, and even the Scholastic Divines, down to the sixteenth century : and the Jesuit Canisius is believed to be the first who, in the third edition of his Latin Catechism, printed at Paris in 1567, made an addition unknown to all antiquity ; defining

“ *Ecclesia* quidem Græcum nomen, et interpretatur  
 “ Convocatio, vel Conventus ; cum sit vel *generalis*  
 “ *Sanctorum unitas, in una fide et dilectione conjuncta ;*  
 “ *unde Una et Catholica dicitur Ecclesia : vel singulorum*  
 “ *societas sancta locorum ; unde et multe dicuntur*  
 “ *Ecclesie ; tandem etiam ipsa domus, in qua ad divina*  
 “ *vel discenda vel celebranda convenit multitudo fide-*  
 “ *lium, Ecclesia vocatur.*” *De Rebus Ecclesiast. cap. 6.*

the



the Church to be “ The visible congregation of all Christ’s faithful . . . which under its one Head Christ, *and one Supreme Pontiff, his Vicar on earth, is governed and kept in unity* \*.” A nefarious innovation ; but which was readily adopted by the retainers of Rome, and gradually slipped into almost every Catechism. To constitute the Church, the Catholic Church, there is no need of a *Supreme Pontiff*, nor indeed of any *visible Head* : neither is it essentially necessary to the existence of the Catholic Church of Christ ; which never

\* “ Ostendit Ecclesiam, id est cunctorum Christi fidelium visibilem congregationem . . . quæque sub uno capite suo Christo ; *unoque, vices ejus in terris gerente Pontifice maximo, regitur, ac in unitate conservatur.*” —Bellarmine’s definition is : “ Cætus hominum ejusdem christianæ fidei professione, et eorundem sacramentorum communione colligatam, sub regimine legitimorum pastorum ; *et præcipuè unius Christi in terris Vicarii, Romani Pontificis.*” —In our common English Catechism, the Church is properly enough said to be *all the Faithful under one Head* ; in as far as that HEAD is JESUS CHRIST. But the question and answer which immediately follow, belong not to the primitive definition of the Catholic Church.

ceases

ceases to be *such*, whether she have a visible Head or not.—The only Catholic Church, then, and, consequently, the only Church to which Indefectibility, or whatever else be contained in the promises of Christ, belongs, is the collective body of Christians, throughout the world.

For the rest, the diversity of sentiments, which exists among our Theologians and Controversialists, about the Church's supposed *Infallibility*, affords many objections, which are not easily answered, in any of the three hypotheses, which are taught and tolerated, within the pale of the Romish Communion.—Let us examine them separately : And

First, the opinion of those, which was once a pretty common one, who lodge Infallibility in the Bishop of Rome.—On what is it grounded ? On two or three texts of Scripture, which have been differently explained in all ages from the commencement of Christianity ! What new infallible Umpire, then, will assure us, that those explanations are certainly false, and

that those of the sticklers for Papal Infallibility are certainly true? *Quis dabit huic sepi sehem?* Besides, if, according to the original proposition, a perpetual, visible, infallible Judge be necessary for the decision of religious controversies, it is impossible that the Pope can be that Judge. It often happens that there is no Pope, for a considerable space of time; and it has not unfrequently happened that there were two, once three Popes, at a time; each of whom claimed the prerogatives of St. Peter's lawful successor; and had a party of abettors in the Catholic world. Were they all infallible Judges? Or which of them was the *one* infallible Judge\*?—In truth, Papal Infallibility is as absurd in itself, as it is pernicious in its consequences; the spurious child of Arrogance and Ignorance, fostered by Credulity and matured by servile Adulation.

• I omit mentioning a number of other arguments against this most extravagant claim; as I am confident that it is scouted by every rational Roman Catholic of the present age; and because I would not tire the reader's patience with unnecessary details.

To



To the French Nation we more particularly owe, that so mischievous a tenet had not a much wider spread. The Gallican Church has always taught a contrary doctrine, and asserted the superiority of a General Council ; to whose decisions the Pope himself is obliged to bend\*. They allowed him to have a principal share in questions about Faith, but at the same time affirmed, that his decisions were not irreformable, without the Church's consent †.

The arguments used by the Gallican Clergy, against the Infallibility of the Bishop of Rome, were these—That it was the Catholic or Universal Church on which Christ conferred that privilege—That it was to the Apostles, and their successors, that he promised to send the Holy Ghost, to instruct them in all truth—That it was to

\* According to a Decree of the Council of Constance.

† “ In fidei quoque questionibus, præcipuas Summi Pontificis esse partes, ejusque decreta ad omnes et singulas Ecclesias pertinere : nec tamen irreformabile esse judicium, nisi Ecclesie consensus accesserit.”—*Propositio 4ta Cleri Gallicani, 1682.*

the

the Church he said, that the gates of Hell should not prevail against her \*, &c.

I know that assumptions are here taken, which Protestants will not readily grant; and, therefore, I bring them forward only to show my readers, what, with respect to Infallibility, is the doctrine of the Gallican Church; which I apprehend to be, at present, also that of most other National Churches in the Romish Communion.—According to this idea, Infallibility may be placed in a General Council, independently of the Pope; or in a Papal Decree, adopted by the Catholic Church. But this is no great compliment to the Bishop of Rome; for the Decree of any other Bishop, or Provincial or National Synod, would, if

\* “ Cette proposition du Clergé est fondée sur ce que  
 “ c’est à l’Eglise Universelle, que Jesus-Christ a donné  
 “ l’Infaillibilité, pour la décision des questions de Foi :  
 “ c’est à tous les Apôtres et aux Evêques, leurs succe-  
 “ seurs, qu’il a promis d’envoyer l’Esprit Saint, qui les  
 “ instruiroit de toute vérité : c’est de l’Eglise qu’il a dit,  
 “ que les portes de l’Enfer ne prévaudroient jamais  
 “ contre elle.” *Loix Eccles. de France*, ch. vi. art. 12.  
 “ p. 223. de la nouvelle Edition.

adopted

adopted by the Catholic Church, be equally infallible.

Although the opinion which lodges Infallibility in a *General* or *Œcumenical* Council, be more specious and less dangerous than that which lodges it in one single Bishop, it must be confessed that it is liable to considerable difficulties. For my own part, I very much doubt if ever there were a Council strictly œcumenical; and I am, moreover, inclined to think, with honest Gregory Nazianzen \*, that Synods of any kind have never done much good; and that some Synods have done considerable evil. But my own opinion I urge not as a part of the Roman Catholic Creed—I only repeat, that it is very difficult for Roman Catholics to prove the *Œcumenicality*, and consequently the Infallibility, of any individual Council. For,

\* Εχω μεν ουτως, ει δει τ' αληθες γραφειν, ωστε παντα συλλογην φευγειν επισκοπων, οτι μηδεμιας συνοδου τελος ειδου χρησιν μηδε λυσιν κακων πολλων εσχληνιας η προσθηκης. *Ep.* 55. al. 42. ad *Procopium*. Our Divines tell us, indeed, that chagrin and disappointment dictated this censure. It may be so; but it is not for that the less true with regard to most Synods.

By



By what certain criterion shall we judge, what Councils are œcumenical, what not? Shall it be by the number of Bishops collected in them? Then the Council of Rimini was as œcumenical as, nay more so than, the Council of Nice; and that of Sardica, than the first of Constantinople.— Shall it be by a universal acquiescence in their Decrees? When did that ever happen?—Shall it be by the approbation and confirmation of the Roman Pontiff? Some deny, others affirm. And this leads me to a third hypothesis concerning Infallibility: namely, that when a General or even a National Council is approved and confirmed by the Pope, its decisions, by that approbation, become infallible. This is the inverse of the Gallican Doctrine, That a Papal decision approved by a General Council becomes infallible. But this criterion is more exceptionable than the former, and in fact it brings us back to Papal Infallibility. According to this hypothesis, the Council of Constantinople would be no General Council, as it was not only not approved

approved by the Pope, but formally rejected by three Popes, Leo, Gelafius, and Gregory ; yet it is now generally acknowledged as an Œcumenical Synod.—On the other hand, the Council of Pifa, although a very numerous Synod\*, and although formally approved by a Bull of Alexander V. is not considered as a General Council. But the most singular instance of the uncertainty of this criterion occurs with respect to the famous Council of Basil. It was first disapproved and dissolved by Eugenius, then approved of by Eugenius, and again disavowed and annulled by the same Eugenius. Yet the French Nation have always considered the Council of Basil as a General Council.

That General Councils themselves, such as bear that name, are always infallible, no candid Roman Catholic will, I think, pre-

\* There were present 22 Cardinals, 4 Patriarchs, 12 Archbishops, 67 Bishops in person, and 85 by proxy, 67 Ambassadors from crowned Heads, a great number of mitred Abbots, Deputies from a still greater number of Abbeys, Monasteries, Universities, Provinces, Cities, Corporations, &c. &c.

tend

tend to say. Will any Roman Catholic deny that General Councils have enacted nefarious things? What sober and rational Roman Catholic of the present day, especially what British Roman Catholic, will deem the Second Council of Nice, or the Councils of Constance and Florence, infallible?—Will any British Roman Catholic of the present day deem infallible the first Council of Lyons, in which the haughty Pontiff deposed an Emperor, and absolved his subjects from their oath of allegiance? Or the 4th Council of Lateran; the third Canon of which (*De Hæreticis*) contains doctrines, which I dare not put in an English dress \*.—Some of our controversialists

\* “*Damnati vero (Hæretici) sæcularibus potestatibus præsentibus, aut eorum bailivis, relinquuntur animadversione debita puniendi . . . . ita quod bona hujusmodi damnatorum, si laici fuerint, confiscantur: si vero clerici, applicentur ecclesiis a quibus stipendia acceperunt . . . . Moneantur autem et inducantur et, si necesse fuerit, per censuram ecclesiasticam compellantur sæculares, quibuscunque fungantur officiis, ut, sicut reputari cupiunt et haberi fideles, ita pro*



ists vainly labour to prove this Canon spurious : the attempt must be laughed at by every sober critic. And shall I or any Roman Catholic be obliged to believe that

“ defensione fidei præstent publice juramentum, quod de  
 “ terris sue jurisdictioni subjectis universos hæreticos ab  
 “ Ecclesia denotatos bona fide pro viribus exterminare stu-  
 “ debunt : ita quodammodo quandocunque quis fuerit in  
 “ potestatem sive spiritualementem sive temporalem assumptus,  
 “ hoc teneatur capitulum juramento firmare . . . . Si  
 “ vero dominus temporalis, requisitus et monitus ab  
 “ Ecclesia, terram suam purgare neglexerit ab hac hære-  
 “ tica scæditate, per metropolitanum et cæteros compro-  
 “ vinciales episcopos excommunicationis vinculo inno-  
 “ detur. Et, si satisfacere contempserit infra annum,  
 “ significetur hoc summo pontifici : ut ex tunc ipse  
 “ vassallos ab ejus fidelitate denunciaret absolutos, et ter-  
 “ ram exponat Catholicis occupandam, qui eam, extermi-  
 “ natis hæreticis, sine ulla contradictione possideant : salvo  
 “ jure domini principalis, dummodo super hoc ipse  
 “ nullum præbet obstaculum, nec aliquod impedi-  
 “ mentum opponat . . . . Catholici vero, qui crucis as-  
 “ sumpto charactere ad hæreticorum exterminium si accinx-  
 “ erint, illa gaudeant indulgentia, illoque sancto privi-  
 “ legio sint muniti, quod accedentibus in terræ sanctæ  
 “ subsidium conceditur.” *Concil. Later. iv.* apud Labbe,  
 tom. xi. p. 147. Is this Christian, Catholic Doctrine ?  
 Is there here any mark of Infallibility ?

Infallibility

Infallibility was lodged in such an assembly?

Remains to be examined a fourth hypothesis, which places Infallibility in the diffusive Body of Christians: according to which opinion, the universal reception of any Doctrine is a proof of its being a genuine part of pure original Christianity, and consequently an infallible truth. This is nearly equivalent to the Rule of Vincent of Lerins: *Quod semper, quod ab omnibus, quod ubique creditum*; a Rule to which, in the abstract, every thinking Protestant, as well as Catholic, will, I believe, have little reluctance to subscribe: but, still, it is no easy matter to apply even this golden Rule to every particular case; as it can be applied only negatively, and would reduce the Articles of Christian belief to a smaller number than, perhaps, any Church admits. For, according to this Rule, every Article of belief which cannot be proved to have been, by the Christians of all times and places, universally believed, must be lopped off from the essentials of Catholic credence. But what then becomes of the

Creed of Pius, of the Creed of Athanasius\*, of the Constantinopolitan and Nicene Creeds, or even of that which goes by the name of the Apostles Creed? For all these Creeds contain, some more, some less, Articles which will not readily square with Vincent's Rule.—Yet, I confess, to myself it has a'ways appeared, that the Rule of Vincent is that alone by which genuine Christianity can be ascertained; orthodoxy discerned from heterodoxy, and the true Apostolic and Catholic Doctrines distinguished from the innovations of hæresiarchs: although in order to apply it we must revolve the history of eighteen centuries, examine all the new Doctrines that have been hatched, and mark every novelty in Religion, from the days of the Apostles to the present day. How few will venture to engage—how few are capable of engaging, in so Herculean a task.

On the whole, then, religious controversies, as well as legal controversies, must, it should seem, be ultimately decided by some

\* I mean that which commonly bears his name: for by him it was not composed.



living Tribunal (for neither Law nor Scripture expounds itself), and the decisions of both these Tribunals must be acquiesced in and obeyed by those who acknowledge their respective jurisdictions; although neither the one nor the other be absolutely infallible in its decisions.—As a Briton, then, is obliged to pay obedience to a decision of law made in a British Tribunal, of which he acknowledges the competency, so is a Roman Catholic obliged to pay obedience to decisions made by such Tribunals as he believes to be competent; whether he deem them infallible or not.

In truth, when we consider that we ourselves are not agreed about the seat of Infallibility, any more than psychologists are about the seat of the soul—and that, where-soever we place it, it has never been determined what are its boundaries, and how far its influence extends? how decisions about matters of faith are to be distinguished from decisions concerning discipline? what

Councils are Œcumenical, what not? when Councils act *conciliariter* or otherwise—or when a Pope speaks *ex cathedra*, or as a private divine, &c.—in a word, what conditions and circumstances are necessary to constitute an Infallible Tribunal?—we can hardly help agreeing with an anonymous writer on what is called the *Popish Controversy*, “That after all that has been written on the Church’s Infallibility, it at last dwindles away into some arbitrary notes and marks\* of a Church; and is at best but a moral certainty †.” Or, with Bishop Burnet, “That the Church’s authority, is rather an authority of *Order*, than of *Infallibility*.” in which sense, I believe,

\* Our Theologians labour to prove that the Romish Church is not only a true Church, but the only true Church; because, say they, she alone has the marks of the true Church: *Unity, Holiness, Universality, and Apostolicity*. But here the *onus probandi* grows excessively heavy on their shoulders: and even the gigantic Bellarmine himself succumbs under the load.

† *Discourse concerning the Judge of Controversies*, 1686. p. 62.

every

every Church, as well as the Roman Church, without pretending to be infallible, acts as if she were so.\* But

\* The following quotation, from a *Dedication to Clement XI.* prefixed to Sir R. Steele's *Account of the State of the Roman Catholic Religion*, will, perhaps, explain how matters stand, in this respect, between us and Protestants. "YOUR HOLINESS is not aware, how near the Churches of us Protestants have at length come to those privileges and perfections, which You boast of as peculiar to your own: so near, that many of the most quick-sighted and sagacious persons have not been able to discover any difference between us, as to the main principle of all *Doctrine, Government, Worship, and Discipline*—but this one; viz. That you cannot err in any thing you determine; and we never do. That is to say, in other words, that you are infallible, and we always in the right . . . . And you must pardon us, if we cannot help thinking it to be as great and as glorious a privilege in us, to be always in the right, without the pretence to Infallibility, as it can be in you to be always in the wrong with it. Thus the Synod of Dort, the Councils of the Reformed in France, the Assembly of the Kirk of Scotland, and, if I may presume to name it, the Convocation of England, have been all found to have the very same unquestionable authority which your Church claims upon the Infallibility which resides in it; and the People to be under the very same strict ob-



But whatever opinion be entertained about the Church's Infallibility, or where-soever it be supposed to lodge, it is generally allowed, even by Roman Catholics—That the Church cannot coin new Articles of Faith, nor abrogate any of those which were taught by CHRIST—that she cannot dispense with any divine, natural, or positive law—that she has not emporal or civil jurisdiction—that all her power and privileges are of a spiritual nature—and that,

“ ligation of obedience to their determinations, which  
 “ with You is the consequence of an absolute In-  
 “ fallibility. The reason, therefore, why we do not  
 “ openly set up an Infallibility is because we *can*  
 “ *do without it*. Authority results as well from  
 “ POWER as from RIGHT; and a majority of votes  
 “ is as strong a foundation for it, as Infallibility itself.  
 “ Councils that *may* err, never *do*: and, besides, being  
 “ composed of men whose peculiar business is to *be in*  
 “ *the right*, it is very immodest for any private person  
 “ to think them *not so*: because this is to set up a *cor-*  
 “ *rupted private* Understanding, above a *public uncor-*  
 “ *rupted* Judgment.—Thus it is in the North as well  
 “ as in the South, abroad as well as at home; all main-  
 “ tain the exercise of the same authority in themselves,  
 “ which yet they know not how so much as to speak  
 “ of without ridicule in others!”

when

when she meddles with any thing that is not spiritual, she exorbates from her proper sphere ; and *quoad hoc*, ceases to be infallible,—With these restrictions and limitations, Infallibility, cannot, I think, be considered as a dangerous Doctrine.—I pass on to another Article ;

#### THE SUPREMACY, POWER, AND PREROGATIVES OF THE POPE.

Here I find my task a difficult one indeed : the more so, as I shall be obliged to make concessions, which many of my communion may think, ought not to be made. But, as Truth and Candour must guide my pen, I will not prevaricate in a single instance.

It is allowed then, it must be allowed, that the Pope's *Supremacy*, and the consequences that seem to flow from it, have always been accounted the greatest obstacle to the emancipation of the Roman Catholics of Britain.—Their adherence and subjection to a foreign Power have been considered as inconsistent with the allegiance

legiance which they owe to their own liege Sovereign, and a legitimate reason for excluding them from the rights and privileges of other British subjects.—For all the other objections against their tenets are, politically speaking, of little or no importance.

They are, indeed, regarded as such by the acute Sir William Blackstone. He fairly allows, that neither *Transubstantiation*, nor *Purgatory*, nor *the Invocation of Saints*, nor any other such speculative opinions peculiar to Roman Catholics, are sufficient reasons to exclude them from the pale of British liberty; much less to subject them to legal pains and penalties. The Pope's Supremacy is the only Article in their Creed, which, in a political view, he thinks exceptionable; and on which he grounds the expediency of continuing to guard against its consequences by penal restrictions. I have been told that one of the first Law Characters of the present day entertains nearly the same idea; and has been more than once heard to say, That nothing but the dependence of the English



Catholics on *that old man at Rome*, and the oath of obedience to him, which their chief pastors take at their ordination, could justify the severity of the British Laws against British Roman Catholics or preclude them from any civil privilege, that Britons are born to enjoy.

Let me endeavour then to destroy this fatal barrier, by showing that the tenet of the Pope's Primacy, rightly understood, and such as it is at present generally held, not only by the Catholics of Great Britain, but by those of most other countries, has nothing in it dangerous to any State or Government; nothing that can authorise the proscription of those who hold it; nothing that should defranchise them from the right of denizens.

I said "such as it is at present generally held:" for it must be confessed, I think, by the most zealous Papist, that it was once a dangerous, a most dangerous tenet.

When circumvested with supposed Infalibility, uncircumscribed by Canons, and in the hands of an aspiring ambitious Pontiff,

it

it could not but be dangerous : and so it proved.—From it, as from the Trojan horse, issued forth an Iliad of evils, which, for a time, destroyed all lawful subordination, and subjected Crowns and Tiaras to the will and pleasure of one absolute ghostly Despot, who governed a great portion of the world with sovereign sway.

Yet this usurped Empire was neither universal, nor, in its highest altitude, of long duration. It fell more rapidly than it rose, and is now almost totally annihilated. Kings no more dread the effects of Pontific rage ; Vatican fulminations are no longer formidable ; Roman Infallibility is laughed at even in Rome itself ; and a Pope's *Bull*, or *Breve*, is, as such, as little regarded at Paris, Vienna, Madrid, and Lisbon ; as it would be at Petersburg, Berlin, Copenhagen or London.

“ Still (it will be urged) the Pope's Supremacy is a Roman Catholic tenet—  
 “ it was once, confessedly, a dangerous  
 “ tenet—what was once dangerous may  
 “ become so again—and, therefore, every  
 “ *Protestant*

" *Protestant* state should be careful to prevent it from ever recovering its former " pernicious influence."—Undoubtedly—and so, too, should every *Catholic* State: and, in reality, there is not, I believe, any Catholic State in Christendom, that it is not as jealous of Papal influence as we can be \*.—But, jealous as they are, they see no danger

\* As a proof of this I need only to appeal to the vigilance, which they are known to exert, to prevent the publication of Papal Rescripts, until they be inspected and authorized by legal National Authority. No Bull, Breve, Constitution or Decree was regarded as obligatory in France, unless it was solemnly published by the Archbishops and Bishops, in their respective Dioceses; and, lest the Bishops should, as sometimes was the case, betray the interests of the Gallican Church, through an interested partiality to the Roman See, the civil Government took special care That no Decree emanated from Rome, should be printed, published or distributed on any pretext or under any Title whatsoever, if it were not first authorized by Letters Patent, enregistered in Parliament. See *Les Loix Ecclesiastiques de France*, E. xv. 7. p. 289.

But, to make this matter still more indisputable, I will give an instance from a Papal Constitution of the most solemn



danger from acknowledging the Bishop of Rome to be in *rank, honour and dignity*, the first

solemn fort ; which, for a long series of years, was annually promulgated on the Thursday of Holy week (or that before Easter Sunday) hence commonly called the *Bull in Cæna Domini*. This Bull was first published by Julius ii. in 1511 ; but enlarged by Paul III. in 1536, and again by Paul V. in 1613 ; with the strongest injunctions to all *Patriarchs, Primates, Archbishops, Bishops, and Ordinaries* of every kind, to have it published in their respective jurisdictions, under pain of incurring the wrath of God, and of the Apostles Peter and Paul, &c. &c.—But did the Catholic world receive this Bull, or pay any regard to the Pope's menaces ? No ! they laughed at his impotent fulminations, and held his threatenings in disdain : and, at this day, the Bull is severely proscribed in almost every Roman Catholic State. I have been told, that its annual publication at Rome itself was suspended by Ganganelli : whether it has since been resumed, I am ignorant ; or whether He who has just now been elected to the Papal Chair will dare to renew so idle and absurd a ceremony ?—But, at any rate, it is a pointless weapon that can hurt no one.

I shall just bring one more instance of the little respect that is paid by Roman Catholic States to Papal Bulls, which inculcate, even but indirectly, pretended Papal prerogative: When Benedict XIII. published in the Roman Breviary, a legend of the Life of Gregory

first Prelate in the Christian Church—a privilege which was early conferred on him, partly from his being the supposed successor of two great Apostles\*, but chiefly from his SEE being in the capital of the Roman Empire; a privilege acknowledged by the Councils of Nice, Constantinople and Chalcedon, and admitted even by the Greeks themselves in the Council of Florence; although they

gory VII. now a canonized Saint, at Rome, it was immediately suppressed in France and Germany; merely because it praises the conduct of Gregory with regard to the Emperor Henry.

\* I know that this Proposition, although Austin's, has been censured at Rome: but Roman censures are no Articles of Catholic Belief: and, I confess, I see no greater claim which the Pope has to be the successor of Peter, than he has to be the successor of Paul. That the latter was at Rome we know for certain: that the former was there, has been doubted; and is at best but highly probable. Irenæus says, that the Church of Rome was founded by two most glorious Apostles, Peter and Paul; *a Gloriosissimis duobus Apostolis Petro et Paulo Romæ fundata et constituta Ecclesia*—Epiphanius says that Peter and Paul were at Rome, both the first Apostles and Bishops—*Εν Ρωμῇ γεγενῆσσι πρῶτοι Πέτρος καὶ Παῦλος ἀποστόλοι αὐτοὶ καὶ ἐπίσκοποι*—And the Ecclesiastical

Historian

they soon repented, and retracted the confession.

But this privilege, whencesoever it flows, when stript of all its usurped appendages, and reduced to its primitive simplicity, is nothing more than, as I have already said, a bare primacy of *honour, rank and precedence*, which is not more dangerous to the liberties of the Christian Church in general, than the Primacy of Lyons is to the liberties of the Gallican, or that of Canterbury to the liberties of the Anglican Church.

I will not here enter into a minute discussion of a question, which is often agitated among controvertists: namely, whether the Primacy of the Pope be of *Divine Right*; that is whether CHRIST himself

Historian Eusebius tells us that Alexander was the fifth Bishop in succession from Peter and Paul: Πεντητην ἀπὸ Πέτρου καὶ Παύλου κατὰ γὰρ διαδοχὴν. I am sensible that, strictly speaking, neither Peter nor Paul were Bishops—they were of a superior rank to that of Bishops—they were Apostles, not fixed to any particular See; but sent to preach the Gospel, wheresoever they found it requisite; and to appoint *Bishops* or *Overseers* in the particular Churches, founded by them.



gave to St. Peter a real Primacy over the other Apostles, and if that gift descend to Peter's successors, the Bishops of Rome? That Popes have claimed such a privilege is unquestionable; and I am sorry to add that most of our theologues are willing to give it him. Yet this cannot be an Article of Catholic Faith, as any one may convince himself by tracing Papal Primacy to its first appearance; and comparing it with the Church-History of the first three centuries.

In the first place, that all the Apostles were equal in *power, rank, dignity and jurisdiction*, was the common doctrine of those early ages: and, this to me, appears so evident, that I have often wondered how a contrary opinion came to gain ground in the Christian world.—But, if there were no distinction of rank or power among the Apostles, how could there be any among their successors in the ministry? Nor indeed is there any, says Jerome in his elegant Letter to Evangelus; “Wherefo-

" ever there is a Bishop, be it at Rome or  
 " at Eugubium, at Constantinople or at  
 " Rhegium, at Alexandria or at Tanis, he  
 " is of the same worth and of the same  
 " priesthood: the power of wealth, and  
 " the lowliness of poverty, renders not  
 " a Bishop more high or low; for all  
 " of them are successors of the Apo-  
 " stles\*."

Secondly, granting, for a moment, that,  
 among the Apostles, Peter had a *primacy*,  
 of some sort or other, it would not follow  
 that this personal privilege descended to  
 Peter's successors, whether at Rome or An-  
 tioch: nor, even in this supposition, can  
 any solid reason be given, why his succes-  
 sor at Antioch should not inherit that pri-  
 vilege, in preference even to his successor  
 at Rome. Antioch was the first-born of  
 the Gentile Churches, where the followers  
 of Christ were first denominated *Christians*;  
 and which the Fathers of the Synod of  
 Constantinople call " the most Ancient

\* Ep. 101. nov. ed. tom. v. p. 802.

and

and truly Apostolical Church \*."—There, Peter is allowed to have first erected his Apostolic Throne, and to have sitten on it seven years; when he left it to Evodius: whereas he must have come to Rome, if he came at all, in the latter part of his life; and, if he had a Throne there, it could not be the *only* Apostolic Throne, nor the *first* Apostolic Throne; for Paul had been there before him, and died there as well as he; and if we believe the *Apostolical Constitutions* (which although a spurious is yet an antient work), *Linus* was ordained the first Bishop of Rome by Paul, and, after the death of Linus, *Clement* was ordained by Peter †. But Irenæus (as has been already observed, says that “ the *two* Apostles, “ when they had founded and reared that “ Church, delivered the Episcopal Office

\* Πρεσβυτάτη, κ' οὕτως αποστολική ἐκκλησία.

† Της δὲ Ρωμαίων ἐκκλησίας Λίνος μὲν, ὁ Κλαυδίας, πρῶτος ὑπὸ Παύλου· Κλήμης δὲ, μετὰ τοῦ Λίνου θάνατον, ὑπ' αὐτοῦ Πέτρου [it is Peter who is made to speak this] δευτέρως μαχρροῦνται. Constit. Apost. lib. vii. c. 46. inter Patres Apostolicos, tom. ii. p. 46. ed. Clerici.



“into the hands of *Linus* \*.” If *Linus*, then, were the first Bishop of Rome, he was as much the successor of St. Paul as he was of St. Peter : although, properly speaking, he was successor to neither in *Apostleship*, which was an office peculiar to the Apostles ; but only constituted by them the first Bishop, or overseer of that portion of the faithful who then resided at Rome ; in the same manner as *Evodius* had before been constituted the first overseer of those who resided at Antioch. But neither *Linus*, nor *Evodius* could succeed to any of the personal privileges of the Apostles, who made them Bishops ; nor, as Bishops, could they claim any Apostolical prerogative, by whatever Apostle they might have been appointed. This is allowed by Bellarmine himself, the great champion of Papal prerogative : “ The Bishops have no part of authority truly Apostolical †.”

\* Θεμελιώσαντες οὖν καὶ οἰκοδομήσαντες οἱ μακάριοι ἀποστόλοι τὴν ἐκκλησίαν, Λίνω τῆς ἐπισκοπῆς λειτουργίαν ἐνεχρίσαν.  
Iren. apud Euseb. v. 6.

† *Episcopi nullam habent partem vere Apostolicæ auctoritatis.* De Sum. Pont. iv. 25.

But

But how, then, came the sole Bishop of Rome to be an exception? and how got he the supposed personal prerogatives of the first of the Apostles, Peter? "It was by Peter's own deed," answer the Romanists; "by his last Will and Testament!"—"And there is good reason," says Barrow, "for their urging this argument: for, otherwise, if St. Peter had died intestate, the elder son of Antioch would have had the best right to all his goods and dignities. But how doth that *Will* appear? in what tables was it written? in what registers is it extant? in whose presence did he nuncupate it?—It is no where to be seen or heard of\*!"—save in the teeming fancy of such writers as Bellarmine; who is not ashamed to say, "It is not improbable, that the Lord gave an express command to Peter, that he should *so* fix his See at

\* Barrow *On the Supremacy*—a work in which the subject is exhausted; and which I would request every British Catholic to peruse, along with his Bellarmine.

" Rome *as that* the Bishop of Rome should  
 " absolutely succeed him \*."

Indeed, a *Jure-divino* Right of *Supremacy*, in the Bishop of Rome or in any other Bishop, appears to me so extremely unfounded, that I often wonder how such a tenet ever came to gain ground in the Christian world. How far my opinion, in this respect, coincides with that of the generality of British Catholics I know not, and therefore speak not here in their name : but it would be disingenuous, in me, in an Apology addressed to Protestants, not fairly to acknowledge, that I find nothing either in Scripture, or universal Tradition, to support a Papal Supremacy of *Divine Right*.

The prerogative of Primacy, which the Bishop of Rome so early received, and afterwards so enormously abused, I believe principally derived from his *See*, or *Throne*, as it is sometimes called, being in the ca-

\* " Non est improbabile, Dominum etiam aperte  
 " jussisse, ut sedem suam Petrus *ita* figeret Romæ, ut  
 " Romanus Episcopus absolute ei succederet."



pital city of the Roman Empire; in much the same manner as Alexandria and other great cities gave subordinate Primacies to their respective Bishops.

The first mention we find made of the Primacy of the Bishop of Rome, is incidentally, in the first Nicene Council; by the sixth Canon of which the Bishop of Alexandria is confirmed in a sort of Primacy over certain districts in Egypt, &c. already sanctioned by usage; and similar to that which, according to the same usage, the Bishop of Rome enjoyed over certain other districts, supposed, with great probability, to be *suburbicarian* regions\*. It is remarkable that, when this Canon was produced by the Legates of Leo, in the Council of Chalcedon, a preface had been added to it, to the following purport. *The Church of Rome had always the Primacy*: an addition, I doubt not, made by the Roman-

\* Τα αρχαία ἐδηκράτειτο, τὰ ἐν Αἰγύπτῳ, καὶ Ἀσίᾳ, καὶ Πενταπόλει, ὥστε τὸν Ἀλεξανδρείας ἐπίσκοπον πάντων τούτων εἶναι τὴν ἐξουσίαν, ἐπειδὴ καὶ τῷ ἐν τῇ Ῥώμῃ ἐπίσκοπῳ τὰ τοιαῦτα εἰσιν. Labbe, tom. ii. p. 32.

ists in favour of that See : for the copy produced by Aetius Archdeacon of the Church of Constantinople, and read in the Council by its Secretary, was found to have no such addition \*."

When the Council of Constantinople, 56 years after that of Nice, raised the Bishop of the New Imperial City to the second rank and dignity, after the Bishop of Rome, it gives for reason, " That Constantinople was then the *New Rome* †;" and this Decree was confirmed by the Council of Chalcedon 70 years after, in the following terms : " Ever following the decisions of the Holy Fathers, and acknowledging the now read Canon of the 150 godly Bishops, we too define and decree the same, concerning the privileges of

\* A similar pious fraud was practised, afterwards, with respect to *Appeals*; and a pretended Canon of the Nicene Council authorising them, was produced by the Legates of Zosimus in the sixth Council of Carthage. See Labbe, tom. ii. p. 1590.

† Τον μὲν τοι Κωνσταντινουπόλεως ἐπισκοπὸν εἶναι τὰ πρεσβεία τῆς τιμῆς, μετὰ τὸν τῆς Ρώμης ἐπισκοπὸν, διὰ τὸ εἶναι νεαν Ρώμην. Can. iii, apud Labbe, tom. ii. p. 947.

" the

“ the most Holy Church of Constantinople;  
 “ *New Rome*. For, as the *Fathers* gave  
 “ privileges to the *Throne* of *Old Rome*,  
 “ *because it was the Imperial City*; so the  
 “ 150 godly Bishops, *induced by the same*  
 “ *consideration*, gave equal privileges to  
 “ the *Throne* of *New Rome*; rightly judg-  
 “ ing, that the City which is honoured  
 “ with the Imperial residence and with  
 “ the Senate, and enjoys equal privileges  
 “ with *Old Rome*, should, like it, be ag-  
 “ grandized also in *Ecclesiastical matters*;  
 “ being, after it, the second in rank \*.”

Against this Canon, in the next Session the Legates of Rome remonstrated, but in vain: it was again publicly read, and

\* Πανταχού τοις τῶν ἁγίων πατέρων ὅροις ἐπομενοί, καὶ τὸν ἁπλῶς ἀναγνωσθέντα κανόνα τῶν ρ. ν. θεοφιλεστάτων ἐπισκοπῶν γνωρίζοντες, τὰ αὐτὰ καὶ ἡμεῖς ὀρίζομεν καὶ ψηφίζομεθα πρὸς τῶν πρεσβείων τῆς ἁγιωτάτης ἐκκλησίας Κωνσταντινουπόλεως, νίκης Ῥώμης· καὶ γὰρ τῷ θρόνῳ τῆς πρεσβύτερας Ῥώμης, διὰ τὸ βασιλευσὶν τὴν πόλιν ἐκείνην, οἱ πατέρες εἰκότως ὑποδεδωκάσι τὰ πρεσβεῖα· καὶ τῷ αὐτῷ σκοπῷ κινούμενοι, οἱ ρ. ν. θεοφιλεστάτοι ἐπισκοποὶ τὰ ἴσα πρεσβεῖα ἀπένειμαν τῷ τῆς νίκης Ῥώμης ἁγιωτάτῳ θρόνῳ, εὐλογῶς κρινάντες, τὴν βασιλεῖα καὶ συγκαταστήσαντες πόλιν, καὶ τῶν ἰσῶν ἀπολαύσαντες πρεσβείων τῇ πρεσβυτέρῃ βασιλεῖδι Ῥώμῃ, καὶ ἐν τοῖς ἐκκλησιαστικαῖς, ὡς ἐκείνην, μεγαλυνισθαι τραγμασί, δευτέραν μετ’ ἐκείνην ὑπαρχούσαν. Labbe, tom. iv. p. 770.



approved by the Synod : but was formally disapproved and rejected by Leo ; who probably foresaw a formidable rival in the Bishop of *New Rome* invested with a power and privileges so similar to his own. His pretext, however, was, to guard the rights of Alexandria, Antioch, and the other more ancient Sees\* ; which he deemed invaded by both the Canon of Chalcedon and that of Constantinople, in opposition to that of Nice : and for this purpose he wrote strong, and even *Papal* Letters to Anatolius, Marcion, and Pulcheria ; but without effect. The Eastern Churches received both Canons, and the Emperors Basiliscus, Zeno, and Justinian enforced their execution.

Here then are three Councils, called General, which mention the Primacy of the Bishop of Rome ; but neither of them assign any other reason, than Rome's having been the Imperial City when the Roman See was first erected there ; and the same cause for giving to the Bishop of

\* Which, however, in the Council of Florence, were given up by Eugenius : and the See of Constantinople declared to be the second in Rank.

Constantinople

Constantinople the second rank of honour and precedence, is assigned by the Councils of Constantinople and Chalcedon ; namely, that Constantinople had then become the Imperial City, or *New Rome*.

But neither the Bishop of *New Rome* nor the Bishop of *Old Rome*, was content with the rank and precedency thus allowed to them. They both vied with one another, who should screw up their privileges to the highest pitch. Both arrogated to themselves powers which had never been conferred on them, and both reciprocally reprobated those arrogations. To the former, together with his second rank of honour, had been allotted a patriarchal jurisdiction over the provinces of Asia, Pontus and Thrace ; but in the reign of Leo Isaurius all the regions between Thrace and Sicily were added to that Patriarchate : and, even before that, John, Bishop of Constantinople, had the audacity to call himself *Œcumenical* or *Universal Bishop* ; for which he was severely reprimanded by Gregory I. who declares it to be a blasphemous title, and a  
sign

sign of the approach of Antichrist \*. The good Father did not foresee, that his own successors would carry their ambition much higher.

When the Bulgarians were converted to Christianity, about the middle of the ninth century, a contention arose between the See of Rome and that of Constantinople, to which of their jurisdictions Bulgaria was to be annexed. Adrian claimed it for the former, for the latter Ignatius. The question was agitated in the fourth Council of Constantinople; and the Patriarchs of the East being of the same opinion with that of the Imperial City, Bulgaria was submitted to his jurisdiction, the Pope's Legates vainly remonstrating. John VIII. was so desirous of having that territory under his immediate jurisdiction, that he offered to the Emperor Basil, to acknowledge Photius for the legitimate Patriarch of Constantinople, if Bulgaria were ceded to him. Basil, to whom the question was referred by

\* See his Letters to the Emperor Maurice, and to the Empress Constantina.



a Synod held at Constantinople, seemed willing to favour the claim of John: but nothing effectual was done. The Bulgarian Bishops and their King Michael would not acknowledge the Pope for their Patriarch: which was one, perhaps the principal, cause why John excommunicated Photius; which created what is called the Greek schism; or a separation of the Eastern from the Western Churches.

From that period, the Western Churches were governed by the Bishop of Rome with a high hand indeed. *Coepiscopacy* and *Confraternity* were now no more. One ghostly Monarch ruled as despotically over "God's heritage" as ever any temporal Tyrant over his subjects; and at length submitted even temporal power itself to his paramount domination.

I need not enter into a detail of the various means by which, in the course of 600 years, this strange and singular Empire was erected; nor recount the enormities of its government; for which every honest Roman Catholic must blush, and say,

say, *Pudet et hæc dici, et non potuisse refelli.*

—I shall only observe, that those enormities would never have been committed, nor such an Empire been at all established, if the Bishops and Kings themselves had not greatly contributed to its support. It was on their weakness, jealousies, ambition and avarice, that the Pope, by slow and insensible degrees, built the stupendous fabric of Papal power.

During all this time, however, there were not wanting men of learning who spoke and wrote against the tyranny of Rome; nor resolute Princes who resisted it; but rarely with success, and seldom with impunity. Even the boasted liberties of the Gallican Church were often disregarded and trampled upon by Pontific pride: and, what is still more unaccountable, Gallican Princes conspired with Popes against the liberties of the Gallican Church, and even against their own royal prerogatives:—and had not the Parliaments and the University of Paris, from time to time,

time, exerted themselves in the defence of both, both would most probably have been annihilated.

But the first regular check that was given to Papal usurpation was a Decree of the Council of Constance, which declares the Pope to be inferior to a General Council, and obliged to submit to its decisions\*. Although the effects of this Decree were, in a great measure, frustrated by the more obsequious Synods of Florence and Lateran; yet, as the Gallican Church tenaciously adhered to it, and made it the basis of their famous *Declaration* in 1682; it was a constant thorn in the side of the Papacy, and at length goaded it into despair. It is true that the Popes still continued to assert their

\* Ipfa Synodus in Sp. Sancto congregata legitime, Generale Concilium faciens, Ecclesiam Catholicam militantem representans, potestatem a Christo immediate habet, cui quilibet cujuscunque status vel dignitatis, etiam Papalis existat, obedire tenetur in his quæ pertinent ad fidem, et extirpationem dicti schismatis, et reformationem generalem Ecclesiæ Dei in capite et in membris. *Concil. Constantiense*, Sess. iv. apud Labbe, tom. xii. p. 19.

former



former claims, both in theory and in practice, long after the Council of Constance; and legions of Monks, Mendicants and other Religious Orders, made independent of ordinary jurisdiction by the Pope's *plenitude* of power, repaid the favour with the grossest adulation; and supported his enormous claims by every art and argument that cunning and sophistry could supply. The common doctrine held and taught by those sycophants of the Court of Rome was: "That all Ecclesiastical Authority  
 "resides in the Pope as in its source, as  
 "alone holding his power immediately  
 "from God, so that the other Bishops  
 "derive theirs from him, and are only  
 "his Vicars—that it is he who gives authority even to General Councils—that  
 "he alone has a right to decide questions  
 "concerning Faith—and that all the faithful are blindly and implicitly to submit to  
 "his decisions, because they are infallible  
 "—that all jurisdiction is vested in him,  
 "and by him delegated to other Pastors—that this jurisdiction extends even to the  
 "souls

"souls in Purgatory, which, if he chose,  
 "he might empty at once \*—that he alone  
 "can make such Ecclesiastical Laws as he  
 "pleases, and dispense, without giving a  
 "cause, with those already made—can de-  
 "stroy the whole Canon Law, and con-  
 "struct a new code in its stead†—that all  
 "Church-goods are at his absolute dis-  
 "posal—that he judges all mankind, but  
 "cannot be judged by any—that all power,  
 "whether spiritual or temporal, is directly  
 "or indirectly lodged in him—and that  
 "consequently he can dispose of crowns  
 "as well as mitres, depose Sovereigns, and  
 "absolve their subjects from their oaths of  
 "allegiance, &c."

Still, however, the University of Paris

\* *Anima in Purgatorio existentes sunt de jure Papæ ; et, si vellet, posset totum Purgatorium evacuare.* Propos. 10. of Friar John Angeli, censured by the University of Paris in 1482. I wonder he did not extend the Pope's jurisdiction to Hell itself, as some one had done before; affirming that Gregory the Great had thence rescued the soul of Trajan.

† *Papæ posset totum Jus Canonicum destruere, et novum construere.* Prop. 8. of the same Friar John Angeli.

and its Doctors maintained the honourable, but unequal contest \*. The writings of *D'Ailly*, *Gerson*, *Tostatus*, *Dionysius Carthusianus*, *Gualterus*, *Arboreus*, *Almain*, *Major*, &c. are replete with irrefragable arguments against Papal despotism: but their voices were not powerful enough to rouse the world from its lethargy. The great number of tongues and pens was on the other side; and the resentment, threats and fulminations of Rome were yet dreadful

\* I find the University, that is the *Theological Faculty*, censuring the odious Doctrine at different periods. In 1387 was censured the following proposition of *Monteson*, a Dominican Friar: *The examination and decision of matters appertaining to Faith belongs to the Pope*. This proposition is declared to contain *a manifest heresy*. In 1429, a similar censure was passed against *Quadrigarii*, a hermit of the Order of St. Austin, who was obliged to retract the following proposition: *Sola Papa potestas, in tota Ecclesia, immediate est a Christo*. In 1470, *John Munerii*, a Dominican Professor of Divinity, was obliged to retract similar propositions. In 1482, *John Angelis*, a Dominican, was censured for maintaining 14 Articles, some of which are highly Papistical. In 1491 passed the famous Decree, in answer to queries of Charles VIII. who, on his return from his Italian expedition, thought seriously



ful things in the eyes of the credulous, unenlightened multitude.

At length a man arose, (one of those extraordinary men who seem born to achieve wonderful feats) who with his single arm shook the fabric of Papal power to its very foundations; and inflicted a wound on Roman Infallibility, from which it never recovered. Need I tell my intelligent readers, that this man was Martin Luther? who about the year 1517 began to preach his *Reformation*; and lived to see the effects of it exceed his most sanguine expectations. In a very short space of time, Saxony, Sweden, Denmark, and several other less Sovereign States had embraced his Doctrines; and not only rejected the Pope's Supreme Power, but totally withdrawn themselves from his communion: and their example was soon after followed seriously of setting about a reformation in ecclesiastical matters. All these examples are prior to the Council of Trent: so that it is ridiculous and shameless in a very recent writer to affirm that the Declaration of the Gallican Clergy in 1682 was a novel Doctrine in the Gallican Church.

by Prussia, Holland, England, Scotland, and a great part of France and Switzerland.

Those nations even, who still adhered to the See of Rome and owned its Supremacy, began now to examine more narrowly its nature and extent, and wondered to see the extremes to which Papal pretensions had been carried. In this examination the Gallican Church still took the lead, and produced defenders of her antient rights and liberties in a greater number, and of more learning, than their predecessors. Among these the names of *Pithou, Du Puy, Fleury, Launoi, Bossuet, Dupin, and Lenglet*, hold a distinguished rank \*.

To stop the torrent of Luther's *heresy* (as it was termed), the Council of Trent was assembled; in which, among other subjects, the Papal power was occasionally agitated, in the 23d Session. I say, occasionally; as it was never the intention of

\* The curious reader may consult a Collection of the principal Pieces, concerning the Gallican Liberties, in a work published at Paris in 1731, in 4 folio volumes.

the Pope or of his Legates to have it at all discussed. But the Spanish Bishops, wishing to recover and assert the antient episcopal authority, against the infringements that were daily making on it by the Court of Rome and its emissaries, proposed to have it decreed by the Council, That Bishops are of *divine institution*; and the question was previously debated by the Theologians in the *Congregations* of October 1st and 2d, 1562.

Meanwhile the Canons on Holy Orders had been formed without any mention of the *divine* right of Episcopacy: and the first six were read in the Congregation of Prelates on the 13th\* of October, and passed without any material opposition. But when the 7th, which only declares the Bishops to be *superior to Priests*, was read, the Archbishop of Grenada insisted on its being declared that Bishops were *instituted*, and *superior to Priests*, by *right divine*; and proved his point with very plausible arguments, from the antient Fathers. But

\* Or the 14th according to Martenne's *Journal*.



as some of these arguments went more to prove the equality of Bishops in general, than their superiority to Priests, the Legates were alarmed at the boldness of the Archbishop, and he was, at their instigation, interrupted in his discourse by Cardinal de Warmia ; who told him that there was no necessity of agitating this question, as it was not contested by Heretics. The Archbishop of Grenada replied, that the divine right of Bishops was expressly denied in the *Confession of Augsberg* ; and again demanded that it should be defined in the Council ; or answers given to his reasons and authorities ; and, being again interrupted, indignantly said, *That he would refer himself to the Nations* : that is, to the Prelates of the different Nations who composed the Synod. In the following Congregations the subject was resumed, and the opinion of the Archbishop was strongly supported by the pious Barthelemi De Martyribus, Archbishop of Braga, and still more powerfully by the Bishop of Segovia. —Of the 181 Prelates who voted on the

question, 59 according to Fra. Paolo, 54 according to Pallavicini, gave their suffrage in favour of the Divine right of Episcopacy : but there were many Prelates (says Visconti) who were not present, partly through indisposition, and partly, because they wished not to speak on the subject\*.

On the 20th of October, Lainez, the General of the Jesuits (for Generals of Orders and mitred Abbots opined in this Assembly), who had been purposely reserved to be the last speaker, although out of order, employed, in a speech which occupied the whole time of the *Congregation* †, all his art and eloquence to overturn the reasonings of the prior speakers, and to maintain the extravagant claims of the Roman

\* Sono molti restati di venire in Congregazione, parte per indispositione, et parte per non voler parlar sopra questa materia.

† “ L'ultimo disputatore, ma fuor dell' ordine, secondo il già detto rito à lui da' Legati prescritto, fù Diego Lainez, Generale della Compagnia di Gesù; il quale parlò a' venti d'Ottobre; ed occupò *egli solo tutto il tempo della Congregazione.*” Pallavic. l. 18. c. 15.

Pontiff. The sum of his discourse is, That the Pope being the Vicar General of God, he alone has a power and jurisdiction immediately from God ; of which he communicates a portion to other minor Prelates \*. The whole harangue is a tissue of sophisms, and assumptions : yet it was applauded by a majority of the Council ; and, no doubt, contributed not a little to the rejection of the words *jure divino* out of the Canon before mentioned.—By the minority the speech of Lainez was as much censured as it was praised by the majority. The Bishop of Paris, in particular, inveighed against it with much indignation, and undertook to answer it in some future congregation : but careful precautions were taken to prevent him.

The French Bishops, however, continued in conjunction with those of Spain to assert their own opinions, and oppugn the ultramontane doctrine about the Papal power : but the patience and address of the Romans got the upper hand ; and the

\* “ Di cui egli fa parte a minori prelati.” *Ibid.*

*divine*



*divine right* of Bishops was *not* declared in the Canon. Nay, their dependence on the Pope is artfully, although indirectly, established in the next Canon: which seems to imply, that the Pope alone has his power immediately from Christ, and the other Bishops theirs from the Pope.

It is necessary here to observe, that the seventh Canon, even as it is now worded, did not please Pius; who sent several models to his Legates; in all of which the plenitude of Papal power was to be established, and the Bishops declared to be no more than his Vicars: “who held indeed  
 “a principal place in the Church, but under the dependence of the Pope, who  
 “called them to a share of his solicitude—  
 “*in partem sollicitudinis.*” And in another Canon, which was proposed to be made, on the authority of the Pope, were to be inserted the following words, as reported by Pallavicini: “If any one shall say, that  
 “the blessed Peter was not, by the institution of Christ, the first among the  
 “Apostles, and his Vicar on earth—or  
 “that

“ that there is, in the Church, no need of  
 “ a Pontiff, the successor of Peter, and  
 “ equal to him in the authority of Govern-  
 “ ment—and that, in the See of Rome,  
 “ his legitimate successors, to the present  
 “ time, have not had the right of Primacy  
 “ in the Church—and that they are not  
 “ the Fathers, Pastors, and Doctors of all  
 “ Christians—and that to them was not  
 “ given, by our Lord Jesus Christ, in the  
 “ person of Peter, the full power of feed-  
 “ ing, ruling, and governing the universal  
 “ Church—*Let him be anathema\**.”

Although this *Formula* was only an ex-  
 tension of the Decree, which Eugenius had

\* “ Sia scomunicato, se alcuno dirà, che il B. Pietro,  
 “ per istituzione di Christo, non sia stato il primo fra  
 “ gli Apostoli, e suo vicario in terra—o che non bisogni  
 “ che sia nella Chiesa un Pontefice successore di Pietro,  
 “ ed eguale à lui nell’ autorità del reggimento—e che  
 “ nella Sedia Romana i legittimi successori di lui fin’  
 “ à questo tempo non habbiano havuto il diritto del  
 “ principatò nella Chiesa; e que non sieno stati Padri,  
 “ Pastori, e Dottori di tutti i Christiani—e che non sia  
 “ stata loro data dal Signore Gesu Christo nel B. Pie-  
 “ tro la piena podestà di pascere, reggere, e governare  
 “ la Chiesa universale.” *Pallavic. l. 19. c. 12.*

had

had the address to get signed, by the Council of Florence, which the Reader may see below \*; yet the French and Spanish Bishops, with Cardinal de Lorraine now at their head, strenuously combated this proposed Decree. They objected to the Council of Florence, as being neither *legitimate* nor *general*; and opposed to it those of Constance and Basil; which the whole French nation, said Cardinal De Lorraine, would rather die than controvert †: and when the Bishop of Senigaglia was employed by the Legates to bring the same Cardinal and the French to

\* Εἰς ὁρίζομεν τὴν ἁγίαν ἀποστολικὴν καθέδραν, καὶ τὸν Ῥωμαϊκὸν ἀρχιερεῖα εἰς πᾶσαν τὴν οἰκουμένην τὸ πρῶτον κατεχεῖν, αὐτὸν τε τὸν Ῥωμαϊκὸν ἀρχιερεῖα διαδοχὸν εἶναι τοῦ μακαρίου Πέτρου τοῦ κορυφαίου τῶν ἀποστόλων, καὶ ἀληθὴ τοποτηρητὴν τοῦ Χριστοῦ, καὶ πατρὸς τῆς ἐκκλησίας κεφαλὴν, καὶ πάντων τῶν χριστιανῶν πατέρα τε καὶ διδασκαλὸν ὑπαρχεῖν, καὶ αὐτῷ ἐν τῇ μακαρίῳ Πέτρῳ τοῦ ποιμαίνειν, καὶ διευθεῖν, καὶ κυβερνᾶν τὴν καθολικὴν ἐκκλησίαν ὑπὸ τοῦ κυρίου ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ πληρῇ ἐξουσίᾳ παραδεδοσθαι. See Labbe's *Councils*, tom. xiii. p. 515.

† “ En France on tient le Concile de Constance pour  
“ general en toutes ses parties; et tient on celui de  
“ Florence pour *non legitime ni general*: et pour cela l'on  
“ fera plutôt mourir les François, que d'aller au con-  
“ traire.” *Du Puy's Mémoires*, p. 556. See also *Vif-*  
*conti's Letter of Feb. 2, 1563.*

some



some sort of agreement, the Cardinal, among other things, replied, that France would never, in any sense, approve of this proposition, "The Pope has authority to govern the universal Church," and that if it were again proposed, the Ambassadors of France would protest in the name of their King and 120 Bishops; in as much as these words went to the condemnation of the opinion held by all France *That a Council is above the Pope*. The views of the Pope and his Legates were thus, in some measure, frustrated; although their pretensions were not given up. The Pope's Theologians took every opportunity to extol Papal power. In the Congregation of the 20th of February, a Portuguese Doctor, called *Cornelio*, affirmed that two propositions (relative to marriage) were heretical, because they had been condemned by several Decretals\*, and thence took occasion to maintain

\* "La preuve est courte (says a French writer), "c'est dommage qu'elle ne soit pas décisive. Au compte de ce Docteur, nous aurions encore bien d'autres articles de foi, que ceux du Concile, si tout ce qui étoit condamné par quelque Décrétale étoit Hérésie."

that

that the antient Councils, in their decisions of Faith, had always followed the will and authority of the Popes; who, he contended, might dispense, against the Canons, against the Apostles, and even against the Divine Law; except in Articles of Faith.—And in another Congregation, Adrien Valentin, a Dominican, speaking on the Article of *Dispenses*, defended what had been said by Cornelio, and added, That the Pope, being superiour to all human laws, had an absolute unlimited power to dispense with them; and that, even if he should dispense without a cause, the dispensation must be accounted valid: with respect to divine laws, he had an equal power to dispense with them, provided there were a legitimate cause. This Doctrine scandalized many (says Fra. Paolo), and gave occasion to the French to speak on the same subject, in a style that very much displeased the partisans of the Pope. The Pope's partisans, however, prevailed in this, as in most other disputes, in which the Pope's power was concerned.

To  
the revocation of a Decree which gave  
them

To omit nothing relative to that subject, as handled in the Council, I shall just mention two other indirect attacks made on the Pope's authority, in the persons of his Legates. When the question was started whether the proxies of absent Bishops should be admitted into the Congregations, a contestation arose whether it belonged to Legates or to the Council to decide that matter. The French Bishops maintained that the Legates had in the Council no other prerogative but that of precedence, which they proved by the example of the Council of Basil, and other antient documents: but the opposite party replied, that the Council could not be a lawful one unless convoked by the Pope, and that to him only belonged to determine, who ought to sit in it, and have the right of voting.—After much disputation the question was left undecided.

Another attack was made on their right to be the *only proposers* in the Synod. The Count De Luna, Ambassador from Spain, had been charged by his Court to demand the revocation of a Decree which gave them



them this exclusive privilege. But although he thrice addressed the Legates on this score, and even threatened to *protest*, the Legates found means to elude the question, and to frustrate his endeavours, through the tergiversation of the Cardinal De Lorraine. All that could be obtained was, that in the 21st Decree of the 24th Session, it was declared that by these words *Quæ proponentibus Legatis, &c.* it was not the intention of the Synod, that the ordinary manner of treating matters in General Councils should be changed, nor to depart from what had been established by the Canons, &c.

On the whole, there was nothing *positive* done in the Council of Trent to restrain the Papal power or to reform the abuses of its exercise: and all that the French and Spanish Bishops could obtain was, that the Decree of the Council of Florence should not be re-enacted, and that the Divine right of Episcopacy should not be explicitly denied.—For the rest, the Popes continued to claim the same powers and prerogatives

as

as before, and now and then to exercise the most odious parts of them : while the French and some other Roman Catholic nations as pertinaciously resisted those claims, and adhered to the Decree of Constance and the Doctrine of primitive times.

The University of Paris, in particular, abetted by the Parliaments of France, and supported now and then by Royal Edicts, stemmed the tide of Transalpine Doctrines, as often as the Papal workmen directed its course to Gaul. In 1641 the Jesuit *Celot* was obliged to retract two propositions which he had advanced in a work *On the Hierarchy*, against the infallibility of General Councils.—In 1656, Francis Gillou, a Minorite, who had published some *Theses* unfavourable to the Gallican Doctrine, was obliged to make the following declaration : “ I acknowledge and confess, that  
 “ the jurisdiction of Bishops is of right divine, and immediately from Christ, and  
 “ that in General Councils they are truly  
 “ Judges, and that the Pope only pronounces from their judgments ; nor did I  
 “ mean,

“ mean, in my These, to advance any thing  
 “ to the contrary \*.”

In 1664, James de Vernant had the audacity to publish in French a book entitled *The Defence of the Authority of our Holy Father the Pope*; in which the Faculty of Paris found a number of censurable Propositions, and censured them accordingly on the 26th of May of that same year. As the Propositions of Vernant contain the essence of all that had before been written in favour of Papal claims, and at the same time shew with what persevering impudence these claims were asserted by the emissaries and retainers of Rome, my readers will not I think be displeased to see the whole of them here translated; with the respective Censures of the Parisian Divines.

\* “ Agnosco et fateor, Episcoporum Jurisdictionem  
 “ esse juris divini, et esse immediatè a Christo, eosque  
 “ in Conciliis Generalibus verè esse Judices, atque in iis  
 “ ex eorum judiciis Summum Pontificem pronunciare :  
 “ neque quidquam in mea These, de qua nonnulli con-  
 “ questi sunt, contrarium dicere intendi. In cujus fi-  
 “ dem subscripsi die 14 Januarii 1656.” *Signatum*  
*Guillou, cum syngrapha.*



## PROPOSITIONS.

“ The Oracles of the Roman Church  
 “ *infallibly* terminate all the differences  
 “ that rise in the Church, because the Pope  
 “ *cannot err* in his judgments, when, as the  
 “ Vicar of Jesus Christ, he proposes an  
 “ Article of Faith, to be generally received  
 “ by all the Church, which (Church) can-  
 “ not be deceived in receiving it ; because  
 “ there are two sorts of Infallibility ; the  
 “ one *active*, the other *passive*. The former  
 “ appertains to the Pope, as the Vicar of  
 “ Jesus Christ ; the second to the Church :  
 “ both authorised by the Word of God.”

## CENSURE.

“ These Propositions, in as far as they  
 “ exclude from the Church an active Infal-  
 “ libility, or authority of deciding and ex-  
 “ plaining doubts arising about Faith by  
 “ the oracle of infallible truth, are *false*,  
 “ *rash*, *scandalous*, and *heretical*.”

## PROPOSITION.

“ There is no authority, inferior to that  
 “ of

“ of God, which can restrain the Pope’s  
“ power, nor make laws for him, who is  
“ subordinate to God only.”

CENSURE.

“ This Proposition, as understood of the  
“ use and exercise of Papal Power, is false,  
“ and derogating from the authority of  
“ General Councils.”

PROPOSITION.

“ Hold for certain that none but he-  
“ retics, and enemies to the Faith, de-  
“ mand Councils; not to condemn their  
“ own errors, but to trouble and disquiet  
“ the whole Church until it be assembled.”

CENSURE.

“ This Proposition, generally taken, is  
“ scandalous with respect to the Church,  
“ and contumelious to General Councils  
“ and the higher Powers.”

PROPOSITIONS.

“ See Cardinal Turrecremata, who, with

“ great learning, proves that the Decrees  
 “ of General Councils must be confirm-  
 “ ed by the Pope, because they receive not  
 “ their jurisdiction immediately from God,  
 “ but by the hands of St. Peter and his suc-  
 “ cessors.”

“ The Council owns, that the power  
 “ and authority to make decrees for  
 “ the whole Church is derived from the  
 “ Pope.”

“ St. Cyril of Alexandria says, that it  
 “ belongs to the Roman Pontiff only to  
 “ reprove, correct, and to establish laws  
 —That is to say, the jurisdiction of Coun-  
 “ cils comes from the Pope.”

“ The second observation which we  
 “ ought to make is, That the Church as-  
 “ sembled in her General Councils receives  
 “ not her authority immediately from  
 “ God.”

“ In this chapter the Cardinal (Turre-  
 “ cremata) brings twelve reasons to show  
 “ the truth of his conclusion. In the sixth  
 “ he maintains that General Councils are  
 “ not of Divine but of human institution.”

“ But



" But if the General Councils receive  
 " their jurisdiction immediately from the  
 " Roman Pontiff, it is evidently certain,  
 " that he always reserves the right of dis-  
 " pensing with, and changing their laws,  
 " when it is useful for the good of the  
 " Church and the salvation of the People.  
 " I know that a Decree of the Council of  
 " Constance may be alleged, which says  
 " that General Councils receive their au-  
 " thority and jurisdiction immediately from  
 " God : but, without regarding it, I refer  
 " my reader," &c.

## CENSURE.

" These six Propositions, in as far as they  
 " assert that the *Church assembled in a Ge-*  
 " *neral Council has not jurisdiction and au-*  
 " *thority immediately from God*, are false,  
 " contrary to the Word of God, and the  
 " definition of the Council of Constance,  
 " and formerly reprobated by the Sacred  
 " Faculty."

## PROPOSITIONS.

" It is a thing unheard in the General  
 " Councils

“ Councils to examine the judgments of the  
“ Sovereign Pontiff.”

“ After this, one must be blind or malicious to deny the sovereign authority  
“ which our Lord gave to St. Peter, and  
“ to the Pope his successor, to judge and  
“ determine ultimately (en dernier ressort)  
“ the questions of Faith.”

“ Un Concile General ne peut retablir  
“ un Evêque dans son siege ; mais cette  
“ puissance appartient seulement au Sou-  
“ verain Pontife.”

CENSURE.

“ These Propositions are false, in as far  
“ as they partly affirm, and partly insinuate, that in no case may appeals be made  
“ from the Supreme Pontiff ; detract from  
“ the authority of General Councils, and  
“ the genuine Doctrines of the Gallican  
“ Church.”

PROPOSITION.

“ The Theologians of Paris, we infer  
“ from what has been said, hold for certain, that this Doctrine is conform to the  
“ common

“ common belief of the Church, and to the  
 “ sentiments of all Catholics. The con-  
 “ trary cannot be affirmed without injury  
 “ to the most celebrated Faculty in the  
 “ world: for it would be to accuse them  
 “ of want of knowledge or zeal to main-  
 “ tain the Christian truths; if it be true,  
 “ that from the words of Christ to St.  
 “ Peter it be necessary to believe that Infal-  
 “ libility is promised to the whole body of  
 “ the Church, and not to the person of  
 “ the Prince of the Apostles.”

## CENSURE.

“ This Proposition imposes on the Sa-  
 “ cred Faculty, who have declared their  
 “ mind in the Articles against Luther, and  
 “ in their Declaration made before the  
 “ Most Christian King in 1663.”

## PROPOSITIONS.

“ All sorts of authority compel me to  
 “ say, That there is nothing in the Holy  
 “ Scripture which obliges us to believe,  
 “ that the Apostles were established Bi-



“shops before the ascension of our Lord  
 “Jesus Christ.”

“The Apostles were consecrated Bi-  
 “shops by the hands of St. Peter.”

“The whole jurisdictional power of  
 “other Prelates is, according to the Com-  
 “mon Law, derived from the Pope.”——  
 “From him they receive the jurisdiction,  
 “which they exercise over their subjects  
 “——It is also true that they receive the  
 “power of the keys through the hands of  
 “St. Peter——Let it be supposed, then, as  
 “a certain truth, that our Lords the Pre-  
 “lates receive from the Pope a power and  
 “an authority which are not given them  
 “immediately by God——If every Bishop  
 “receive his power immediately from  
 “God, independently of St. Peter and his  
 “successor, not even as the instrument of  
 “Jesus Christ ; we could not acknowledge  
 “a superior principality in the Church of  
 “Rome over all other Churches, but a per-  
 “fect equality ; and it would be impossible  
 “to say that the conduct of a Bishop is  
 “subordinate to that of the Pope : for, if  
 “his

" his jurisdiction come immediately from  
 " God, he would not depend on the Ro-  
 " man Pontiff.—The Bishops have no  
 " power over the sheep-fold of our Lord,  
 " but through a dependence on the suc-  
 " cessors of St. Peter: but if they re-  
 " ceive their jurisdiction immediately from  
 " Jesus Christ, their jurisdiction would  
 " not be subordinate to that of the Pope,  
 " —The jurisdiction of inferior Pas-  
 " tors cannot be subordinate to the dispo-  
 " sition of the Pope, if it come not from  
 " him, either in its origin, or if, at least,  
 " it be not instituted by God, and given  
 " by the hands of the Pope—Surely,  
 " there is no difference, but an entire  
 " equality, between the Pope and the Bi-  
 " shops, if it be true, that every one re-  
 " ceives the keys of knowledge and power,  
 " that is, all jurisdiction, immediately from  
 " the hand of Christ."

## CENSURE.

" These Propositions, of which the first  
 " two assert *that the Apostles were not con-*  
 " *stituted Bishops by Christ*; and the follow-  
 " ing

“ing ones : *That the jurisdictional power of*  
 “*Bishops is not immediately from Christ ;*  
 “are false, contrary to the Word of God,  
 “and formerly reprobated by the Sacred  
 “Faculty. And in as far as, in the last four  
 “Propositions, the author infers, *from the*  
 “*supposition that Bishops were instituted im-*  
 “*mediately by Christ, that therefore there is*  
 “*a perfect equality between Bishops and the*  
 “*Supreme Pontiff, and no sort of subordina-*  
 “*tion ; these Propositions are false, rash,*  
 “and give occasion to subvert the order  
 “of Hierarchy, and especially the Primacy  
 “of the Pope.”

But all these Censures intimidated not the Popish Party. The very next year a Proposition was brought before the Faculty from a book written by Guimeneus a Spanish Jesuit ; to the following purport :  
 “It is of Faith that the Pope cannot err.  
 “This conclusion is so certain, that I have  
 “no hesitation in asserting that the con-  
 “trary is heretical \*.” Which Proposition

\* *De fide est Papam errare non posse. Hæc conclusio*  
*ITA certa est, ut offerere non dubitem, contrarium esse here-*  
*ticum.*



is thus censured by the Theological Faculty of Paris : “ The Doctrine contained  
 “ in this Proposition is false, rash, con-  
 “ trary to the Liberties of the Gallican  
 “ Church, and injurious to the Universi-  
 “ ties, the Faculties of Divinity, and the  
 “ orthodox Doctors.”

To give the greater weight to these Censures, and the better to secure the Gallican Liberties from fresh attacks, was framed in an *extraordinary* Assembly of the French Clergy, in 1682, the famous DECLARATION, already mentioned ; and which the reader may see at length in the *Appendix* :—notwithstanding which, the very next year, a printed Proposition was circulated in Paris to the following purpose :  
 “ It belongs to the Apostolic See only  
 “ (meaning the See of Rome), by a divine  
 “ immutable privilege, to judge of contro-  
 “ versies of Faith :” which Proposition was, on the 19th of May of that same year, censured by the Faculty in the following manner : “ This Proposition, in as much  
 “ as it excludes from Bishops and even  
 “ General Councils the authority of judging  
 “ contro-

“ controversies in matters of Faith, which  
 “ they have immediately from Christ, is  
 “ false, rash, erroneous, against the prac-  
 “ tice of the Church, contrary to the Word  
 “ of God, and renewing a Doctrine other-  
 “ wise reprobated by the Faculty.”

It is evident that both the Censures of the University of Paris, and even the Declaration of the Gallican Clergy, are drawn up in the most moderate terms ; and give rather too much than too little to the Bishop of Rome. But so long and deeply had the minds of men been impressed with the idea of an unlimited Papal Power, that the French Doctors and Prelates were fain to make a sort of composition, and to confine within *some* boundaries what before had none. I have no doubt that these boundaries will be still more narrowed, if ever it happen (which is much to be wished) that the Catholic Powers consent to, and encourage, the meeting of a real General Synod from all parts of the Christian world ; a free, independent COUNCIL, which shall revise not only the Decrees and Constitutions of Popes, but those even  
 of

of prior Councils, and form a Creed and Code of Laws, according to the pure Doctrines of the Apostolic age and certain practice of antiquity : *Quod semper, quod ubique creditum* : for this and this alone is genuine absolute *Catholicity*.

Meanwhile, (to return to my Apology) we must be contented with the Gallican *Declaration*, such as it is, until a better and more explicit one be resolved upon.— And now let me ask every intelligent and candid Protestant, if there be any danger to be apprehended to any Protestant State or Government from the maxims contained in the foresaid Declaration, adopted as it has been by almost all other Roman Catholic Nations, and particularly by the great bulk \* of British Catholics ? Is there, at present, any Protestant State on the Continent that has the smallest suspicion of danger arising from the exercise of Papal Power ?

Why, then, this bug-bear should be for-

\* I have seen only two pitiful Publications, one in English, the other in bad French, reflecting on the Gallican Declaration; and supporting Papal Infallibility.



midable to Britain only, and made a pretext for excluding a whole class of Britons from the rights of Nature, is to me, I confess, a matter of much surprise; and I cannot help trusting, that when the subject shall be attended to and thoroughly canvassed by our Legislature, it will appear to them in the same light in which I have here represented it.

I have dwelt the longer on this article, both because it is, in reality, of very great importance in the controversy between us and Protestants; and because it seems, to me, to have been more or less *misunderstood* by most of our own writers, and more or less *misrepresented* by most of our adversaries.

The Primacy of the Roman Bishop *misunderstood* is the original sperm, which produced a spawn of Doctrines, not only hostile to every Civil Government, but everfive of primitive Christianity; by changing the kingdom of Christ into an absolute Autocracy, and concentrating in one Person the rights of an whole Community. Had the Bishop of Rome been  
contented

contented with a Primacy of rank and dignity, which early usage, confirmed by the approbation of Synods and Imperial Edicts, conferred on him, the enormities which sprang from an usurped and unlimited Supremacy would never have ensued; and, perhaps, until this day, his Primacy of rank would never have been vehemently contested, nor wrested from him by the civil Powers\*.—But this is the common fate of all exorbitant claims: they seldom totter, without falling to their foundations.

I have said, on the other hand, that the Doctrine of the Pope's Supremacy, as it is now generally held, is apt to be *misrepresented* by Protestant writers, even of some eminence; who still combine with it all the excesses, which at some periods accompanied it; and combat imaginary phantoms, which have long ceased to have any real existence.

\* Our James I. had no objection to the Pope's being called *Patriarch of the West*: and the great Leibnitz, although a Lutheran, wished to see a Primacy in Spirituals assigned to the Bishop of Rome. Grotius was not far from being of the same opinion.

If,

If, then, I have been able and happy enough to lay before my readers, whether Protestants or Papists, "or both between," a just, impartial idea of Papal *Pre-eminence*; such as at first it *was*, afterwards *became*, and now *is*; may I not flatter myself that some prejudices on *both sides* may be removed, a considerable part of the controversy retrenched; and, at any rate, that all moderate Protestants will grant, that holding the Pope's *Supremacy* in things merely *spiritual* (whether by *divine* or *human* right) is not a sufficient cause for excluding those, who conscientiously hold it, from the political rights and privileges of civil Society.

Of the Oath in the Roman Pontifical, which our Bishops, for some centuries back, have been accustomed to take at the time of their consecration; and which, some years ago, gave rise to an animated controversy in a sister kingdom, I have now little to say: as it was not urged by the late Pope in the latter consecration of Irish Bishops; and will most probably be, at length,



length, withdrawn from the Ordinal in the same clandestine manner it appears to have crept into it. It is wanting in every Ms. copy in England, which I have inspected myself, or caused to be inspected by others: and I have in my possession a printed edition, as late as 1542, which has it not. The Rubric, indeed, in this edition refers to some Oath (*Juramentum*) to be taken by the Bishop elect; but this Oath was secretly couched in the written Commission, or *Mandatum Apostolicum*: and I have no doubt, but it was a long time in use, in some form or other, before it was inserted in the Pontifical in its present form\*.—

Foi

\* The first Christians, with respect to Oaths, were downright Quakers. The words of Jesus: "Swear not at all," (Matth. v. 34.) were to them a *precept*, and not a mere *counsel*: and this doctrine is inculcated by all the early Fathers in the most explicit terms. See *Justin. Apol.* I. No. 16.—*Clem. Alex. Ped.* l. iii.—*Origen. Tract. in Matt.* tom. iii. p. 910.—*Greg. Naz. Orat.* 53. p. 760. ed. Bill.—*Epiphan. Hares.* 6. tom. i. p. 44.—The same is taught by Athanasius, Basil, Chry-

K

softom,

For the rest, it is evidently an Oath of *fealty*; and such an Oath, as I would not take, to be Bishop of Durham, or Archbishop of Toledo. How the French and German Bishops could ever take it, I cannot well conceive; unless they considered that ambiguous clause "*salvo meo Ordine*," as a sufficient *salvo* for the wound which the oath otherwise inflicts not only on Episcopal independence, but on sound Christian morality.—But, *transeat cum cæteris erroribus*! May it rest in peace, and may its *manes* never more disturb the peace of the softom, Hilary, and others: and indeed, to use the words of the last-mentioned Father, "To those who live in the simplicity of Faith, there is no need of the tie of an Oath: since with them what is, always is; and what is NOT, always is NOT."—*Ergo in Fidei simplicitate viventibus jurandi religione opus non est; cum quibus semper quod est, est; quod non, non.* Comment. in Matt. p. 628. ed. Ben.—But, alas! the *simplicity of Faith* became gradually obsolete; and gave way to Judaical and Pagan ceremony. Oaths were multiplied in proportion as Honesty decreased: and Christians were accustomed to swear by those very GOSPELS, in which *all swearing* is forbidden!

Christian

Christian world!—If the Legislature of Great Britain deem it dangerous to the British Constitution, let them proscribe it *in toto*: and I will venture to say, that no Pope will in future be daring enough to enforce; no British Catholic will have the temerity to defend; no British Roman Catholic Bishop will agree to take it.—Of the origin, nature, and progress of this strange Oath, see the Appendix, No. III.

I have yet another political prejudice to encounter of no small magnitude; namely, that it is a part of our Doctrine, *That faith is not to be kept with Heretics*; and consequently that our Protests, Declarations, and even our Oaths are not to be depended on.

Now, that this odious, detestable Doctrine has actually been taught by Romish Divines and Canonists, I will not, I cannot deny. What is more, I am obliged to allow, that Popes themselves have taught and practised the same Doctrine, and even appealed for the truth of it to Canonical sanctions. When Innocent III. excommunicated the Emperor Otho, he not only declared his



subjects free from their Oaths of allegiance, but justified this conduct by the authority of the Fathers : for thus he expresses himself in a letter to the French King Philip Augustus : “ But if he (the Emperor) incur the sentence of Excommunication, let him know, that all are absolved from their fidelity to him : for, according to the Canonical sanctions of the Holy Fathers, *with him, who keeps not faith with God and his Church, faith is not to be kept*\*.” Here then we find a Pope arrogating to himself, and exercising, the power of absolving subjects from,

\* “ Quod si se in sententiam Excommunicationis iniecerit, universos a fidelitate sua noverit absolutos ; quia juxta SS. Patrum sanctiones Canonicas, ei qui Deo et Ecclesiæ fidem non servat, fides servanda non est.” The same thing he repeats in his Letter to the Princes of Germany. “ Unde, cum, juxta SS. Patrum Canonicas sanctiones, ei qui Dei et Ecclesiæ fidem non servat, *fides servanda non fit*, a communione fidelium separato, Nos ab ipsius fidelitate absolvimus universos, vel potius decrevimus absolutos.” Both these curious Epistles were first published by Du Theil, in 1789, from a ms. in the French King’s Library. See *Notice des MSS. du Roi*, vol. ii. p. 282—285.

their

their fidelity, and supporting that act by a pretended Canonical sanction, "That no faith is to be kept with one who keeps not faith with God and his Church;" than which a more dangerous and hateful position can hardly be maintained. It is in vain, that some of our modern Controvertists deny that ever such Doctrines were taught: the fact is indisputable: but still, what has all this to do with the Roman Catholics of Great Britain, who have again, and again, protested and declared, and solemnly sworn—That such tenets are no part of their Creed?

But it may be urged—I am sorry to say, it has been urged, by unfair, ungenerous opponents, That our *swearing* is no sure criterion of our real sentiments, no secure bond for our allegiance: because the Pope may dispense with any oath which we may take to Government—even with that by which we swear that the Pope cannot give us such a dispensation! This is subtilizing indeed. The British Catholic solemnly swears, *That he acknowledges in the Pope no*

K 3

power

*Dispense of the Faith*

*Allegiance absolute in the*

*power to depose Princes, or free their subjects from their oaths of allegiance, on any pretext whatever—That he sincerely believes that Faith is to be kept equally with all mankind, whether they be reputed Heretics or not—and, That no power on earth can dispense with the strict and literal observance of this Oath, which he declares (still on oath) that he takes without restriction or mental reservation—And yet, strange to tell, it is said, He cannot be believed!*

If there be any Protestant of common understanding and candour, who may still suspect that *a snake lurks in the grass*, I would ask him this plain question: If the English Catholics imagined that the Pope could dispense with their oaths, why have they so long persevered in refusing to take the Oaths of *Supremacy* \*, and the *Test*? and

\* As an individual, I have been long of opinion, that the Oath of Supremacy ought to be taken by the Roman Catholics of Britain, after the explanation given to it in the reign of Elizabeth: and this, I believe, is the opinion of several sensible persons of our Communion.

But



and so re-enter, all at once, into their British birth-rights?—This consideration alone, one might think, should stop the mouth of *Captiousness* itself.

If, then, I had to deal only with BLACK-STONES and THURLOWS, and other such Characters, I might here surcease from my task of an Apologist. I might say: “The only plausible objection that has been made against restoring to British Catholics the common rights of Britons, having been shown (as I trust it has been shown) to be in the eye of sober reason a frivolous objection; an objection founded on the false supposition that the Pope’s *Spiritual Supremacy*, as

But as others, and perhaps a much greater number, deem the Oath ambiguous, and in some sort captious, might not the Legislature explain its nature in a more explicit manner, and make it palatable to scrupulous consciences, without destroying its original intent? Or, perhaps, a formal declaration of the ordinary expounders of law might be sufficient. At any rate, the refusing to take it, unexplained as it is, is a manifest proof that the refusers believe not that the Pope can dispense with such Oaths.

“ understood and held by the British Ca-  
 “ tholics, is inimical to, and incompatible  
 “ with, the principles of the *British Con-*  
 “ *stitution* and *British Government*: it fol-  
 “ lows, that the exclusion of the British  
 “ Catholics from the native rights and pri-  
 “ vileges of their fellow-countrymen, is  
 “ neither *liberal*, nor *Christian*, nor even  
 “ *political*, in whatsoever sense the last  
 “ term may be taken; and that a complete  
 “ repeal of the penal laws still in force  
 “ against Popery, is loudly claimed by *Rea-*  
 “ *son, Religion, and common Justice.*”

But, although what I have already said  
 would, in my apprehension, be sufficient  
 to convince such personages as I have just  
 now mentioned, that our claims are not  
 unjust; there are others (and their name is  
*Legion*) who are not so easily satisfied, and  
 to whom, others of our *real* or *pretended*  
 tenets, in which we *differ*, or *seem to differ*,  
 from Protestants, appear, in some degree  
 and indirectly, politically dangerous: in as  
 far as they are supposed to influence our  
 moral conduct, with respect to those whom

we

we deem Heretics ; and, at the same time, to be injurious to the interests of genuine Religion, which is the great bond of civil society ; and corruptive of the pure worship of God by ridiculous ceremonies, superstitious rites, and even gross Idolatry !

This, I think, is the highest colouring that can be given to the Portrait : let us see how far it resembles the Original. For an Apologist, like the Apostle Paul, is “ Debtor both to the Greeks and to the “ Barbarians, both to the wise and to the “ unwise \* ;”—and I have undertaken to *apologize*, the best I can, for the British Roman Catholics, and their distinctive Tenets.

Now the first, that strikes my view, as the most objectionable, is the Doctrine *That there is no salvation out of the Catholic Church* : a Doctrine which appears to me so *harsh*, so *uncharitable*, and (let me add) so *Antichristian*, that I cannot possibly acquiesce in it. But is this Doctrine peculiar to the Roman Catholics ? No : it

\* Rom. i. 14.

has,



has, with certain modifications and explanations, been adopted by almost every Christian Communion : and Creeds and Confessions of Faith containing that Doctrine are said, or sung, or subscribed to, by every established Protestant Church with which I am acquainted. I know that, of late, the Theologians of most Protestant Communions have laboured to mollify the odious tenet ; particularly those of the Church of England ; who allow that salvation may be had even in the Communion of the Church of Rome : and as concession commonly begets concession, the Theologians of the Church of Rome have found out *two* expedients to *save* Protestants : *Invincible Ignorance*, and *Invincible Necessity*. Thus, in theory, they are nearly upon a par : and as neither have the actual power of *saving* or *damning* ; we may trust that a just and good God will, in the distribution of his rewards and punishments, be guided by far other rules than the conceits of peevish Casuists.

But were this odious Doctrine a peculiar tenet of the Roman Catholics, and by them held

held literally, absolutely, and without modification ; I cannot well see how, politically speaking, it could be a dangerous tenet, unless it were productive of *intolerance* and *persecution*. If these, indeed, were the natural and necessary fruits of it, I should have no hesitation in calling it, not only a *dangerous*, but a *damnable* Doctrine ; and would not offer a single word in its excuse. The question then is, Whether intolerance and persecution be the necessary consequences of believing that *There is no salvation out of the Church*.

A Sophist might, possibly, answer in the affirmative, and say ; that Heresy being a damnable sin, its spread is to be prevented and checked by every possible mean ; and as this can be done, effectually, only by persecution and penal laws, Heretics must be detected, prosecuted, and even put to death, if they cannot otherwise be reclaimed. So reasoned the authors of that infamous Tribunal, the *Inquisition* : and so, long before them, reasoned Constantine, Constantius, Theodosius, and other *Christian* Emperors ;

Emperors \*; and, after them, a shameful catalogue of *Christian* Kings and *Commonwealths*, Papist and Protestant; who, in almost every corner of *Christian* Europe, have been the persecutors of those who were of a different persuasion, and often persecutors unto death.

But who will say that those persecutions were the natural and necessary consequences of any *Christian* tenet; even of that once common *Catholic* tenet, "That none can be saved out of the true Church?" The

\* How differently, and more christianly, the Emperor Jovian! who, although firmly attached to the Faith of the Nicene Fathers, would never allow the Arians to be persecuted. "If any one believe amiss" (said he), he must give an account to God: 'tis God "who knows the heart"†.—How differently even the *Apostate* Julian! "It is my resolution (says he, Ep. 43.) to treat the Galileans with such humanity, that none of them suffer violence, or be in any shape maltreated on account of his Religion"—And, in another place: "By the Gods, I will not permit the Galileans to be put to death, struck unjustly, or suffer any harm!" Blush, ye *Christian* Ferdinands, Emmanuels, Lewises, Philips, Henries, Maries and Elizabeths!

† See Sozomen. l. vi. c. 5, and Socrat. l. iii. c. 25.



early Christian Fathers, who held this opinion, reprobated the sole idea of persecution being annexed to it. It is their uniform doctrine, "That religion ought to be preserved by the same means it was first established, *Preaching* accompanied with discretion, prudence, patience, and the practice of all the virtues." This is the language of Tertullian, Athenagoras, Hilary, Athanasius, Chrysostom, Lactantius, Ambrose, Augustine \*, Gregory, in short, of almost every Doctor of the primitive Catholic Church.—I will not say that some Doctors, without prudence, did not, now and then, hold a different opinion, and instigate the civil powers to ferocious deeds: but their number was small, in those early times, and their conduct was generally reprobated by their fellow teachers. St. Martin, Bishop of Tours, with a number of other Prelates (among whom St. Ambrose) separated themselves from the communion of Ithacus and Idacius, be-

\* I am sorry to say, that he once departed from this Doctrine, with respect to the Donatists.

cause these justified the persecution of the Priscillianists. Even in that nation, where the Inquisition afterwards reigned in its highest power, we find a Council of Toledo, in 633, forbidding any violence to be used for the conversion of Jews; but that persuasion only is to be used for that purpose \*: and, in latter and more barbarous times, there have not been wanting *Orosios* and *De las Casas* to plead the cause of humanity and toleration even in Portugal and Spain †.

It gives me great pleasure to observe, that, when our Saxon ancestors were con-

\* “De Judæis autem hoc præcepit sancta Synodus, “nemini deinceps ad credendum vim inferre . . . sicut “enim homo proprii arbitrii voluntate serpenti obediens “periit, sic, vocandi Dei gratiâ, propriæ mentis conversione homo quisque credendo salvatur. *Ergo non vi sed “libera arbitrii facultate ut convertantur, suadendi sunt, non “potius impellendi.*” Concil. Tolet. iv. cap. 57. Labbe, tom. v. p. 1719.

† In proportion as learning and philosophy have made a progress in those kingdoms, superstition and intolerantism have much abated: and I have little doubt of the Spaniards soon becoming one of the most enlightened and liberal nations in Europe.

verted

verted to the Christian faith, there was no compulsion used to induce them to change their religion by their newly converted King Edilberth: who imitated not the fiery zeal of the Constantines and Charlemagnes; but listened to the voice of his Apostolic Teachers, and made use of no influence, beside his own example, to induce his Pagan subjects to be baptized.

“ For he had learned (says Bede) from his  
 “ Doctors, that the service of Christ is vo-  
 “ luntary, and ought never to be com-  
 “ pelled \*.”

In latter times, however, swarms of Doctors arose of a very different complexion; who not only dissuaded not Kings from persecution, but instigated them to persecute, and threatened them with divine vengeance if they did not persecute. Were these Doctors all Roman Catholics? No: a certain portion of them, at least, were staunch Protestants: and the punishment,

\* *Didicerat enim a Doctoribus auctoribusque suae salutis, servitium Christi voluntarium, non coactitium debere esse.*  
 Eccles. Hist. l. i. c. 27.



even the capital punishment of an Heretic was defended and practised by both parties. Few, very few Gamaliels appeared on either side : yet in France alone I could name a Godeau, a Camus, a Flechier, a Fenelon, and a Fitz-James ; all of the Episcopal Order, and one of them a Cardinal. At present, I believe, no person on the Continent is disfranchised on account of his Religion ; and a *full unlimited toleration* is the general word of the day. The Spirit of persecution is fled, and fled, it is to be hoped, for ever, from the Christian world.

Having thus travelled over the most rugged parts of my path, I see the road before me more smooth and easy, and expect to get to the end of it without much interruption, as political stumbling-blocks stand no more in the way.

The remaining differences between us and Protestants regard, chiefly, *The number and nature of the Christian Sacraments—Grace—Good Works—Works of Supererogation—Invocation of Saints—Veneration of Images and Relics—Purgatory—and Prayer*  
 7 for

*for the Dead—Clerical Celibacy—Religious Orders—Pilgrimages—Consecration of Churches, Bells, Crucifixes, Images, Water, Oil, Candles, Palm-Branches, Beads, Rosaries, Medals, Agnus Dei's, &c. &c.* of all which I mean to give a fair and candid statement, and leave to my Protestant readers to determine whether any of them be dangerous to Civil Society, so as to merit the proscription of those who believe, or practise them.

#### THE NUMBER AND NATURE OF THE SACRAMENTS.

I am not altogether sure, if I should reckon the number of *our* Sacraments among the contradistinctive Doctrines of Roman Catholics: I certainly should not do it without restriction. For, although the Church of England, in her Catechism, mentions only *two* “as generally necessary to salvation,” this very qualification seems to suppose, that she admits other Sacraments, although *not* “generally necessary to salvation:” and we shall see presently

sently that, in fact, she admits nearly the same number with ourselves.

For, first, there is no dispute between us about *Baptism*: “ wherein the person baptized in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost, receiveth a death to sin, and a new birth unto righteousness.” I need say nothing of the other ceremonies with which Baptism is, in our Rituals, administered; as they are confessed to be unessential; and certainly seem to favour, somewhat, of superstition, although they are mostly of great antiquity.

Nor, secondly, should there, I think, be any dispute about *Confirmation*: for, although it be not denominated a Sacrament in the English Service, it is undoubtedly considered as a sacred Rite; and administered in much the same manner as in the Church of Rome. The *Chrismation* is only omitted, which by the most learned of our Divines is allowed to be no necessary part of the Sacrament.

Thirdly, the *Eucharist* or the *Lord's Supper* is believed to be, and specifically called,



called, a *Sacrament* by both Churches : and the sole controversy is about its *nature* and the *manner* of administering it. This, indeed, is a controversy that has been more agitated than perhaps any other, not only between the Roman Catholics and Protestants in general, but even between Protestants and Protestants. The great question is, What is the precise meaning of these words, THIS IS MY BODY—THIS IS MY BLOOD, employed by Jesus Christ when he instituted this Sacrament. Are they to be taken *literally* or *figuratively* ? and, if the former, how are they to be explained ?

A very large class of Protestants believe, with Zuinglius and the Sacramentarians, that the words are a mere figure, and that there is no real Presence, of any kind, of the Body and Blood of Christ in the Eucharist : and this opinion is soon likely to prevail in almost all Protestant Communion\*.

\* It is not easy to say what was the real opinion of Calvin, as he seems not always consistent with himself : but I believe the Calvinists of the present day are, in this respect, all Zuinglians.

The opinion of Luther, Melancthon, and the Protestants of the Confession of Augs-  
burg, was very different. They held a  
strictly real presence ; asserting, that the  
true Body and Blood of Jesus Christ were  
literally and substantially received together  
with the Bread and Wine : and this has  
been called *Impanation*, *Subpanation* ; and,  
sometimes, *Consubstantiation* ; but many  
Lutherans of the present day seem to have  
relinquished their Master's standard, and  
gone over to the Sacramentarians.

The Doctrine of the Church of Eng-  
land, on this point, is in her Catechism  
expressed thus : “ Q. What is the out-  
ward part or sign of the Lord's Supper ?  
“ *A.* Bread and Wine, which the Lord  
“ hath commanded to be received. Q. What  
“ is the inward part or thing signified ?  
“ *A.* The Body and Blood of Christ, which  
“ are *verily* and *indeed* taken and received  
“ by the faithful in the Lord's Supper.”—  
This last *answer* resembles so much that  
of our common Catechisms, that some  
have thence concluded that the Doctrine  
of

of the Church of England with regard to the *Real Presence*, is very nearly the same with that of the Church of Rome. But this is an egregious mistake. By turning to the 28th *Article* we clearly see what sort of *Real Presence* is believed by the Church of England. “The Body of Christ is given,  
 “ taken and eaten in the Supper only after  
 “ an heavenly and spiritual manner: and  
 “ the mean, whereby the Body of Christ  
 “ is received and eaten in the Supper, is  
 “ Faith.”—This, in my apprehension, differs not a hair’s breadth from pure Calvinism. It was vain then in Parker, the half-Popish Bishop of Oxford, to labour to prove that the Church of England held a *Real Presence*.

On the other side, the Roman Catholics hold, that the words of the institution are to be taken in the strictest literal sense; and that they import a true local, corporeal, substantial Presence of the Body and Blood of Christ united to his Soul and Divinity—and the Councils of Lateran and of Trent have ventured, in some measure, to define



the very *modus* in which this corporeal presence is effected : namely, that the whole substance of the Bread is converted into the Body, and the whole substance of the Wine into the Blood, of Jesus Christ ; the mere accidents or sensible qualities of Bread and Wine remaining.—And this conversion is called

TRANSUBSTANTIATION ;

A term which was deemed so strange and odious by our English Legislators, that the abjuring of it in a solemn manner is, at this day, a principal part of the National *Test-oath* : which, for more than an whole century, has been considered as a necessary bar to exclude Roman Catholics from both Houses of Parliament, and from almost every civil employment in the State. Yet I think it would be hard to point out, how the belief of *Transubstantiation* can be dangerous to the State.

The worst that can possibly be said of it is, That it is an *absurd* Doctrine : and, to confess, if the words of the Council of Trent be literally understood, they seem to imply

imply a palpable absurdity.—It is, indeed, much to be lamented that Church-Assemblies, in their Decrees and Formulas of Faith, did not content themselves with such terms as they found used by Christ and his Apostles. A great many idle contests would have thereby been prevented; and the Christian *Credenda* kept within a much narrower compass than they now embrace. But *Platonism* first, and afterwards *Peripateticism*, having gradually got possession of the Schools and Universities, the simple Doctrines of the Gospel were blended with metaphysical subtleties; and Canons and Constitutions were often made in a language, which perhaps the framers themselves did not well understand: Hence some of their Decisions seem absurd and inadmissible.

For example, when the Council of Ephesus decreed the Mother of Jesus to be the Mother of God, Θεοτοκος; they decreed a blasphemous absurdity, if the word Θεοτοκος, *Deipara*, be literally understood: for how can the eternal and immortal

God be born of a mortal Woman? But our Divines explain away the absurdity thus: "The Godhead was united to the  
 "manhood of Christ—But the manhood  
 "of Christ was born of Mary—Therefore  
 "Mary may in some sort be called the  
 "*Mother of God.*"—The terms *Hypostasis*,  
*Person*, and even the word *Consubstantial*, are liable to the same misapprehension; but above all the unlucky word  
 TRANSUBSTANTIATION.

When the Berengarian Controversy raged, although a *Real Presence* of some kind or other appears to have been the more common Doctrine; yet the terms in which it was asserted are general and ambiguous. Lanfranc, the antagonist of Berengarius, expresses his sentiments on it in the following manner: "We believe  
 "that the terrestrial *Substances*, which are  
 "sanctified at the Holy Table, are converted in an ineffable, incomprehensible,  
 "admirable manner, by the operation of  
 "the Supreme Power, into the *Essence* of  
 "the Body of our Lord, their *Appearances*  
 "with



“ with their *Qualities* remaining.”—And, in another place; “ It is a mystery, which “ we must believe, without asking for an “ explanation.”

If the Lateran and Tridentine Fathers had kept to such general terms; or even to the Doctrine of Nicholas II. and his Roman Council\*; they would have spoken a language less liable to troublesome objections, more agreeable to at least some of the early Doctors, and more easily defended against the Figurists: but they seem to have thought, that they could not too strongly express the belief of a real *substantial, corporeal* Presence, in opposition to one *typical* and virtual; and, for that purpose, adopted the word TRANSUBSTANTI-

\* The profession of Faith which Berengarius was made to make in this Council was as follows: “ The “ Bread and Wine, which are placed upon the Altar, “ are after consecration not only a Sacrament, but *also* “ the true Body and the true Blood of our Lord Jesus “ Christ.”—*Panem et vinum, quæ in altari ponuntur, post consecrationem, non solum sacramentum, sed etiam verum corpus et verum sanguinem Domini nostri Jesu Christi.* Concil. Rom. apud Labbe, tom. ix. p. 1011.

ATION; a word unknown to all antiquity, and never heard of until toward the middle of the . . . nth century \*.—The Council of Trent, however, sanctioned it anew, and pronounced Anathema to those who did not admit its propriety, by the following Canon: “ If any one shall say, That, in the  
 “ most holy Sacrament of the Eucharist,  
 “ the substance of the Bread and Wine re-  
 “ main together with the Body and Blood

\* It is generally thought that the term was invented by the fourth Lateran Council: but this is a mistake. Stephen, Bishop of Eudes, who flourished about the middle of the tenth century, in a Tract to be seen in the 6th Tome of *Bibliotheca Patrum*, expresses himself thus: “ Oramus, ut cibus hominum fiat cibus angelorum; scilicet, ut oblatio panis et vini *transubstantietur* in corpus et sanguinem Jesu Christi.”—And in the Latin Acts of the Council of Florence, the Greeks are made to confess, “ that the Bread is transubstantiated and becomes the Body of Christ:”—

*Fateri nos diximus, transubstantiari sacrum panem, et fieri corpus Christi.* But it is remarkable, that in the Greek copy there is no word of *Transubstantiation*; for it runs thus: Ημεῖς εἶπομεν, ὅτι ὁμολογοῦμεν μὲν ΤΕΛΕΙΟΥΣΘΑΙ τὸν θεῖον ἄρτον, καὶ γένεσθαι σῶμα Κυρίου—a phraseology more similar to that of primitive times, than the Latin expression.

“ of

“ of our Lord Jesus Christ; and shall deny  
 “ that wonderful and singular conversion  
 “ of the *whole substance* of Bread into the  
 “ Body, and of the *whole substance* of Wine  
 “ into the Blood, the species of Bread and  
 “ Wine only remaining; which conver-  
 “ sion the Catholic Church most fitly calls  
 “ *Transubstantiation*: let him be *Anathe-*  
 “ *ma* \*.” — This is certainly more expli-  
 cit than the Lateran Confession, which is as  
 follows: “ The Body and Blood of Jesus  
 “ Christ are truly contained in the Sacra-  
 “ ment of the Altar; the Bread being, by  
 “ power divine, *transubstantiated* into the  
 “ Body, and the Wine into the Blood.”

It is, then, on the authority of these two

• “ Si quis dixerit, in Sacrosancto Eucharistiæ Sacra-  
 “ mento remanere substantiam panis et vini una cum  
 “ corpore et sanguine Domini nostri Jesu Christi, ne-  
 “ gaveritque mirabilem illam et singularem conver-  
 “ sionem totius substantiæ panis in corpus, et totius  
 “ substantiæ vini in sanguinem; manentibus dumtaxat  
 “ speciebus panis et vini: quam quidem conversionem  
 “ Catholica Ecclesia aptissime Transubstantiationem  
 “ appellat; anathema sit.” Apud *Labbe*, tom. xiv. p. 808.

Synods



Synods only \*, that the belief of Transubstantiation is grounded : and those who believe

\* In what light the early Fathers considered the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper, it is not easy to say. They seem not always consistent. Many volumes have been written by Catholics to prove that the Fathers are on their side ; and as many by Protestants to prove quite the contrary. Those, who wish to see the arguments on both sides, may consult the long controversy carried on between the Gentlemen of Port-Royal and the minister Claude : in which all that *erudition*, *eloquence*, and *art* could do, was done, to make antiquity speak the language of the respective combatants. For my part, from the lecture of that controversy, or rather from that of the Fathers themselves, I confess that I find no vestige of *Transubstantiation* in the first *four* ages of Christianity. For, although the writers of those ages pretty generally teach, that, in the sacrament of the Eucharist, the Body and Blood of Christ are *truly* received ; yet they at the same time, almost uniformly, affirm, that the *Bread* and *Wine* are the *Types*, or *Figures* of that Body and Blood : and the scholastic John Damascen (*alias* Manfur) is the first, I believe, who deviates from the old track ; and who (from his excessive zeal to combat the enemies of Image-worship, who maintained that " the Eucharist is the only Image of Christ ) expressly " asserts in the 14th chapter of his *Book On Orthodox Faith*, that the Bread and Wine are not the *Types* of " Christ's

lieve either of these Synods to be infallible, must believe Transubstantiation, in some sense or another ; although they may claim, and do claim, a right to understand and explain it their own way.—Various explanations have accordingly been given, which the reader, if he choose, may see in Bellarmine. That which seems to be most in vogue at present is, That the substances of the Bread and Wine are *annihilated*, and the Body and Blood of Christ substituted in their stead. This is not a new opinion, it was that of Scotus and his followers: in opposition to Bonaventure and the Thomists; who thought that, Annihilation once admitted, there could be no substantial

“ Christ’s Body and Blood, but the *very* Body and “ Blood of the Lord.”——In a Council of Constantinople of 338 Bishops, in 574, in which Image-worship was severely reprobated, the old language with respect to the Eucharist was, in consequence, resumed: but the second Council of Nice, on re-establishing Image-worship, renewed the Doctrine of Damascen: and this Doctrine, although evidently different from *Transubstantiation*, most probably paved the way for it.

Insinuation

Presence

Presence of Christ. *Non nostrum inter eos  
tantas componere lites.*

In what manner I, as an individual, understand, and would explain the Doctrine of *Transubstantiation* (for I have as good a right to explain it my own way as the Thomists or Scotists, as Bellarmine or the Bishop of Boulogne) it is not necessary to tell my readers. I will only say, That I do not understand it *literally*. Nay, I am willing to allow that, literally understood, to me it appears to be, what it is called by Protestants, an *absurd* and *incredible* Doctrine.

But, surely, surely the presumed *absurdity* of a Doctrine is not a subject of prosecution: so that to make a public and solemn denial of *Transubstantiation* the test of a good citizen, is, in my humble opinion, as great an absurdity as *Transubstantiation* itself is supposed to be. Will the belief of *Transubstantiation* make a man a worse member of Society, or a greater enemy to Civil Government? Is it incompatible with any moral virtue that man can practise, or any political



political duty that he may be called to fulfil?—The Roman Catholics and many modern Protestants hold the Calvinistic Doctrines of *Election, Reprobation, inadmissible Justice, Assurance, &c.* to be *absurd and impious* tenets: but were a Roman-Catholic or a Protestant State to make the formal abjuration of them a Test of Loyalty, would not every Protestant who believes those tenets, with reason, complain of the injustice?—The whole Body of Unitarians consider the Doctrines of a *Trinity, Incarnation, Satisfaction, &c.* as absurd tenets as Transubstantiation: but if a Socinian State were to make the holding of any of these Doctrines a State-crime, and require the abjuration of it is an indispensable qualification to enjoy the rights of Society; would not every Protestant as well as Catholic cry out “Shame on such tyranny!”

Transubstantiation, then, in whatever view it be considered, cannot, in the eye of the most acute observer, be politically accounted a dangerous Doctrine: and consequently the Law that excludes those who believe

believe it from the full participation of political Rights and Privileges cannot be deemed a just and rational Law.

Connected with the controversy about the Eucharist is

#### COMMUNION IN ONE KIND :

Which Protestants condemn as contrary to the institution of Christ, and in fact but half a Sacrament. Our Divines deny this, on the principle, That Jesus Christ being whole and entire in each of the species, nay in each of the smallest particles of each of the species, the whole effect of the Sacrament is produced by receiving either the one or the other.

This indeed is the Doctrine of the Council of Trent: "If any one shall deny, that in the venerable Sacrament of the Eucharist, the whole of Christ is contained under each species, let him be Anathema \*." This is called the Doc-

\* "Si quis negaverit, in venerabili Sacramento Eucharistiae sub unaquaque specie, et sub singulis cujusque speciei partibus, separatione facta, totum Christum contineri; Anathema sit." *Can. III. p. 108.*

believe

trine

trine of *Concomitancy*; and is thought to arise naturally out of the Doctrine of *Transubstantiation*. But how far it is *intelligible* I will not take upon me to say: suffice it, that it is at least a *harmless* Doctrine; although it may certainly be impugned with mighty arguments. For the rest, it is allowed that Communion in one kind has at all times, in some cases, been practised, and that the reception of both kinds is not absolutely necessary: although, on the other hand, it must be confessed, that the prohibition to receive under both kinds is a manifest innovation, made by the Council of Constance, and re-sanctioned by the Council of Trent: but contrary to the usage of both the Eastern and Western Churches for a series of 1400 years; and on the authority only of a few Scholastic Divines, who lived after the 4th Lateran Council. This cannot be denied: and will not, then, every serious and candid Roman Catholic, with me, lament, that ever the Cup was withdrawn from the Laity; and heartily wish to see primitive discipline restored, in this particular respect?—The refusing

M

of



of the Cup to the Laity was one of the principal causes of that defection from the Roman Catholic Church, which happened in the sixteenth century ; and is still one invincible obstacle to a re-union. Come we now to

#### THE MASS :

Which, of all the Articles of our Religion, has, I think, been the least understood and the most egregiously misrepresented by our Adversaries—and sometimes even, I fear, by our own Casuists and Controversialists : Else how is it possible, that it should ever have been made a matter of prosecution in a civilized and enlightened country ? Were a Turk or Chinese to study our language and laws, and to read in our Statute-Book, that *saying Mass* is punishable by a forfeiture of *two hundred marks* ; and *hearing Mass* by a penalty of *one hundred* ; must he not wonder within himself, what kind of “ saying ” this can be, which, in one of the most polished nations in Europe, exposes the *Sayer*, and his *Hearer*, to such heavy fines ? And if he were a Turk of any curiosity,

iosity, he would doubtless inquire into the nature and quality of the crime.

But what must his surprise be, if, after the strictest and most minute investigation, he should find, that *saying Mass*, is neither more nor less than celebrating, in the Latin tongue and with different ceremonies, the same Rite of Religion which the National Church celebrateth in English!

Yet this is undoubtedly the case. The commemoration of the death of Christ, and of his bloody sacrifice on the cross, is the object of both the English Communion-Service and of the Roman Mass; according to the injunction of the Saviour himself: "Do this in remembrance of me." And the only essential difference is, that the Church of Rome calleth this commemoration, though but an *unbloody* and *mystical*, yet a *real* Sacrifice (a consequence of her belief of a real, though but mystical, presence of Christ in the Sacrament); whilst the Church of England acknowledgeth in it, either no Sacrifice at all, or at most a tropological one. When I say the Church of England,

I mean, here, the Church of the present day: for, if I were allowed to pick and choose from among her Divines of the last century, I could produce a number of respectable names, whose ideas on this head are very little different from those of the most rational Divines of our Communion \*. For I confess that many of our Scholastics have written a great deal of nonsense on the subject, for which I am neither able nor inclined to apologize. It is enough for me to have explained the genuine Catholic Dogma; in which whoever finds matter for a penal Statute, a Statute pregnant with death †—must have a wonderful disposition to imitate that famous Legislator, who is said to have written all his laws in blood.

\* Compare Bossuet, Nicole, Gôther, &c. with Johnson, Grabe, Taylor, Montague, Cave, &c.

† I say “a Statute pregnant with death:” because, although the penalty of barely *saying Mass* was punishable only by a Fine; yet as the *saying of Mass* was long considered as a sufficient proof of a person’s being a Popish Priest ordained beyond the seas, the detecting of such a person made him liable to the penalties annexed to Treason, and sent him to the Gibbet.

But



But if the Mass be in itself so innocent a thing, why is it said in a language which the people do not understand? Why is a great part of it muttered over in secret? Why is it accompanied with so much idle unmeaning gesture, and ceremonious pageantry? Why, in short, is it not reduced to the same decent simplicity with the English Service; and divested of every semblance of pious fraud and mysterious imposition?

Though these queries are but indirectly connected with my design; yet, as they have been long a subject of reproach, and are daily thrown in the teeth of the English Catholics, I will, for once, give them a fair answer—and the only fair answer, I think, which can be given—Namely, that it is extremely difficult to abolish inveterate rites, either religious or civil; and that the most rational innovations in either will (were it for no other reason but because they are innovations) be generally opposed by the wrong-headed Many, who are so obstinately wedded to old prejudices, that they often will adhere to them

in defiance of every authority. How much more will this be the case when authority accords with custom, and when the prepossessions of the Subject are fostered by the approbation or acquiescence of the Superiour!

In this predicament is the present Roman Liturgy. It was originally composed in Latin, because the Latin tongue was then the common language of the Roman Empire. Whether any part of it then were muttered in secret, may be controverted; though the affirmative is the most probable. It is also probable that it was accompanied with some external ceremonies, though with far fewer than now encumber it. For the Christian Religion, become the Religion of the State, assumed, throughout, a new external appearance; and when She erected her Empire on the ruins of Paganism, She adopted no small part of Pagan pomp and pageantry. Her Liturgy partook of the general fate, and assumed a new form. To conciseness and simplicity succeeded verbosity and splendour:

the Ceremonial of both Jews and Gentiles was ranfacked for precedents ; and where these failed, invention was put on the rack for new improvements. Thus ceremony was added to ceremony, decoration to decoration, rite to rite, until the whole became fo overloaded with tinsel and trappings, as loudly to cry for retrenchment.

Retrenchments were at length made, but with too fparing a hand. Many abfurd and ridiculous ufages were ftill tolerated and are ftill practifed, in moft Catholic countries : (for why pretend to deny or palliate what every traveller may verify ?)—and it will, probably, be yet fome confiderable time, before all the rubbifh be cleared away. The laft correction of the Roman Liturgy was in the Pontificate of Urban VIII. one hundred and fixty-fix years ago \* ; at a time

\* Succeeding Popes have done little more than crowd it with a number of New Feftivals, to the almoft total exclusion of the Sunday and Ferial Offices ; with a view to gratify the different Religious Orders, who were ambitious of thrufting into the Calendar as many of their own Saints as poffible.



when critical learning was far from its manhood, and philosophic learning but in its first infancy. No wonder, therefore, if many things remain in it, which, in a more enlightened and less superstitious age, appear to stand in need of excision.

Yet, after all, I will venture to say that the Roman Missal\*, even in its present imperfect form, is, in general, as good a model of Liturgical composition as now any where existeth. Of this I need not another proof but this, that not only all those Catholic Bishops on the Continent, who have within this century reformed their respective Liturgies, have made very little improve-

\* I cannot say the same of the Roman Breviary. It is, in the whole, a wretched compilation, except the Psalms and Scripture Lessons; and even these are often badly chosen, and worse arranged. It is certain that Benedict XIV. intended once to correct it. Clement XIV. (Ganganelli) is said to have had a similar intention. And, no doubt, the present or some future Pontiff will set about it in good earnest: the sooner the better. But there is no necessity that we should wait for a Papal reformation of our Liturgy. We had a Missal and Liturgy of our own long before we used that of Rome; and we have as good a right to reform our own Liturgy

improvement on it; but even those who first compiled, or since revised, the English Book of Common-Prayer, did little more than translate from the Latin Original. Let me add, that, wherever they abandon this Original, there is, if I mistake not, a want of dignity in their composition, that immediately betrays the innovation.

The Roman Missal then, with some little alteration and improvement, need not be ashamed to appear in a vernacular dress: and why it has not already appeared in a vernacular dress, and divested of every odd exotic ornament, has often to me appeared a pro-

Liturgy as the Gallican Church hath; in which there is hardly a Diocese that hath not a Breviary of its own. The most perfect models I have seen are those of Paris and Limoges. Yet (what is very remarkable) they both, in my opinion, fall short of a Breviary that was planned and executed by Cardinal Quignonés, above two hundred and fifty years ago: but which, though approved by two Popes, and published at Rome itself, was, through the ignorance and bigotry of the times, suppressed almost on its first appearance; and is now a rare and curious book. The French Bishops have availed themselves of it, though not so much as they might,

blem,

blem, which admitteth no other solution than—*Sic voluere Patres!* The day however, I trust, is not at a great distance, when every National Church will open her eyes to reason, and perform every part of the Divine office in the language of her own country, unaccompanied with any ceremony that has the least resemblance of farcical exhibition.

This ought to be the wish of every well-informed and zealous Catholic. But it should not be the wish of Protestants. For, surely, of all the obstacles to our making Profelytes in a Protestant country, (about which we daily hear such pitiful declamation) a Latin Service clogged with Asiatic formality is one of the greatest. So that, were I a Protestant Tyrant, who wished to prevent, in my dominions, the growth of Popery by pains and penalties; instead of proscribing their Latin Liturgy, I would forbid them to have it in any other language, or to perform it in any other guise than they do at present: for much the same reason as the Emperor Julian forbade the Christians



Christians of his time to read the fine Authors of Greece ; lest, by that means, their minds being enlarged and their taste refined, they might cease to be deemed Barbarians, and become less contemptible.

But is not the adoration which Roman Catholics pay to the *Host*, a species of Idolatry ? They are frequently told so by Protestant writers of almost every denomination ; but they positively deny the charge. They believe, with the Church of England, that Jesus Christ is to be adored wherever he be ; and believing him to be present in the Sacrament of the Eucharist, they have no scruple in adoring him there. If their belief of his *Real Presence* there be ill-founded, they are in a grievous mistake, to be sure ; but they cannot be called *Idolaters*, unless Christ be an Idol : for to him and him alone their adorations are paid.— They have the same plea here, as the Church of England, and indeed most other Protestants have against the charge of Idolatry brought against them by the Socinians.

Socinians. For, when these call the worship of Jesus *Idolatry*, because it is adoring a mere Man; it is replied, that Jesus, in the belief of those who adore him, is not a mere Man, but God equal to his Father; a belief, however, which an Unitarian deems as absurd as other Protestants deem his Real Presence in the Sacrament. Nothing, I think, but the over-boiling fervour of controversy could have induced such men as Stillingfleet, Tillotson, Secker, to charge Roman Catholics with Idolatry, for their worshipping, not a *Wafer* or Cup of *Wine*, as these writers are pleased to gloss it; but Jesus Christ himself, who is supposed, and by them believed, to be present under the appearances of Bread and Wine. Call the belief an *absurd* belief, if you will; but call not the worship *Idolatry*.

On the other Sacrament I shall be brief, because the difference between us, concerning them, is either not great, or of small importance. For,

Fourthly, that the Sacrament of *Penitence*,

tence, or *Penance*, that is, *Repentance* for Sin with the *Confession* of it, is likewise accounted by the Church of England a Sacramental Rite, at least, is plain to me from her Office of the *Visitation of the Sick*; in which the form of Sacerdotal Absolution is as strong and as specific as that in the Roman Ritual. The Church of England does not, indeed, *enjoin* “a special confession of sins:” but she *counsels* it.—As to *Satisfaction*, which our Divines call the third part of this Sacrament, it is a mere Integrant, which is not accounted essentially necessary. When the Penitential Canons were in vigour, it was a severe discipline; at present it is, for the most part, a trifling infliction of a few prayers or pious practices\*.

\* Here was the place to speak of *Indulgences*, the flagrant abuse of which gave rise to Luther's Reformation. At present, they are neither *fold* nor *bought*; and are, in every respect, very harmless, unnecessary things; about which the Roman Catholic world, in general, care very little. I need not tell the intelligent reader, that at first they were considered only as a relaxation of the Penitential Canons: although they afterwards became a lucrative article in the traffic of Rome.

Fifthly,



Fifthly, I hardly think that any person of the Church of England will deny that *Ordination* is a Sacrament; in as much as it is supposed to confer a spiritual power on the Ordained; and, if they be properly disposed, Grace to enable them to perform their respective functions in due manner. The additional *Orders*, as they are called, in the Hierarchy of the Church of Rome, are acknowledged to be ecclesiastical institutions only: yet they are allowed to be of high antiquity. They are all expressly mentioned in the fourth Council of Carthage, in 398; and the same or nearly the same ceremonies accompanied their respective *Ordinations*, then, as at this day are practised in the Church of Rome \*. At present the four *minor Orders*, as they are called, are not *real*

\* For example: "Subdiaconus, cum ordinatur, quia  
 " manus impositionem non accipit, patenam de Episcopi  
 " manu accipiat vacuam, et calicem vacuum. De manu  
 " vero Archidiaconi, urceolum cum aqua, et mantile,  
 " et manutergium." *Can. v.*—"Acolythus, cum ordi-  
 " natur, ab Episcopo quidem doceatur qualiter in officio  
 " suo agere debeat. Sed ab Archidiacono accipiat cero-  
 " ferarium

real Offices, but steps to the higher Orders; and might all be easily dispensed with, as well as the clerical *Tonsure*, which is a sort of initiation into Orders.

Sixthly, That “Solemnization of Matrimony” is also a *Sacramental* or *Sacred* Rite, in the estimation of the Church of England, may be inferred, I think, from the prayers and ceremonies that accompany it. And, indeed, Matrimony is by the Apostle Paul called a *Sacrament*, a *great Sacrament*; or *Mystery*\*.”

Seventhly, *Extreme-Uction* is the only Sacrament

“ferarium cum cereo, ut sciat se ad accendenda ecclesie luminaria mancipari. Accipiat et urceolum vinctum, ad suggerendum vinum in Eucharistiam sanguinis Christi.” *Can. vi.* — “Ostiarius, cum ordinatur . . . tradet ei Episcopus claves ecclesie de altario decens: Sic age quasi redditurus Deo rationem pro his rebus, quæ his clavibus recluduntur.” *Can. ix.* See the rest in *Labbe*, tom. ii. p. 1200.

\* Το μυστήριον τούτο μέγα ἐστίν: in the Vulg. rendered, *Sacramentum hoc magnum est.* In what particular sense the words *Μυστήριον* and *Sacramentum* are here to be taken, I will not now dispute: nor is it indeed of any moment, whether Marriage be called a *Mystery*, or a *Sacrament*,

Sacrament in the Romish list, of which there is no vestige in the English Liturgy : yet of all the Sacraments, not immediately instituted by Christ himself, this seems to have the fairest claim to that title. “ Is  
 “ any one sick among you (says an Apo-  
 “ stle), let him call in the Presbyters (or  
 “ Elders) of the Church : and let them pray  
 “ over him, anointing him with oil in the  
 “ name of the Lord : and the prayer of  
 “ Faith shall save the sick *person* ; and the  
 “ Lord shall raise him up, and if he have  
 “ committed sins they shall be forgiven  
 “ him \*.”—Here then, say our Theolo-  
 gians, is an external Rite, accompanied  
 with internal Grace, which is all that is  
 necessary to constitute a Sacrament : and  
 I do think, that this must be allowed to be  
 a Sacrament, or neither ; if it be allowed that it confers a  
 blessing on the married couple, if they be duly dis-  
 posed.

\* Λαμβει τις εν υμιν ; προσκαλεστω τους πρεσβυτερους  
 εκκλησιας και προσευξασθωσαν επ' αυτον, αλειψαντες αυτον  
 ελαιω εν τω ονοματι του Κυριου και η ευχη της πιστεως σωσει  
 τον καμοντα, και εγερει αυτον ο Κυριος : κ' αν αμαρτιας η πε-  
 ποιηκως, αφηθησεται αυτω James v. 14, 15.



at least a very specious argument.—I know that specious arguments are brought against it ; which it is needless here to discuss : as it will, I presume, be granted, that it has Apostolical authority in its favour, as well as the general custom of the Oriental Churches.

With respect to a number of general questions concerning the *Matter* and *Form* of the Sacraments, the *Indelible Character*, the *Opus operatum*\*, &c. &c.—all these *Scholastic subtleties* I leave to the Theologues to wrangle about as long as they please : they enter into no part of my Apologetical plan.—I therefore hasten to

\* These words have been strangely misunderstood and misrepresented by Protestants. It surprised me, but the other day, to read in a work lately published by the present Bishop of Lincoln, the following words : “ The “ Papists contend that the mere receiving of the Lord’s “ Supper procures remission of sins *ex opere operato*, as it “ were mechanically, whatever may be the character “ and disposition of the Communicant.” *Elem. of Christ. Theology*, vol. ii. p. 491. I wish the good Bishop had pointed out any Papist, of any country, who teaches, or ever taught, such a doctrine.

other points of more moment; and, in particular, to the controversy about the nature and operations of

GRACE :

Concerning which there have been sad bickerings between not only Catholics and Protestants; but between Catholic and Catholic, Protestant and Protestant!—Among the Catholics, are three principal systems; that of the *Dominicans*, that of the *Jesuits*, and that of the *Augustinians*: not to mention the *Jansenists*, who in some points differ from all the three: and the disputes have sometimes been carried on with so much ardour and acrimony, that the adversary's doctrine has reciprocally been pronounced *Heretical*, or *bordering on Heresy*!

In the first Confessions, or Professions of Faith, made by the various denominations of Protestants, there is something like an *Harmony* to be seen\*: but at present, I

\* See *Corpus et Syntagma Confessionum*. My edition is that of Geneva, 1654.

believe,

believe, there is a much greater diversity of opinion among them, than there is between some of them and us. Few of them are rigid Calvinists, and not a few of them are professed Pelagians.

But, notwithstanding all the differences which have arisen about the *operations* and *consequences* of *Grace*, all agree in one thing, namely: That it is *A supernatural gift of God gratuitously given to man*: whence, says St. Austin, it has its name: *Gratia meritò nominatur, quia gratis datur*. Now, further than this, in my opinion, it is not necessary to be agreed. For all the other questions about *Free-Will*, *Election*, *Reprobation*, *Sanctification*, *Salvation by Faith*, or *by Works*, or *by both*, &c. are so many metaphysical quibbles, that ought never to have destroyed the harmony of Christians, or created a single schism in the Church of God.—The Calvinist Doctrine on *Predestination* is, in my apprehension, the most exceptionable of all; and great pains have been recently taken by the writers of the Church of England, to show that it is not



the Doctrine of the Thirty-nine Articles\* ; —so odious does it appear to them. But, odious as it may appear, or be, no one will say that it deserves civil proscription. The Calvinists themselves deem it a most consolatory Doctrine : why disturb them in the enjoyment of it ?— And why disturb us in the enjoyments of our *Free-Will* and *Good Works* : unless we make a bad use of the former, and neglect to practise the latter ? —Ay, but our

#### WORKS OF SUPEREROGATION !

Our *Works of Supererogation*, I fear, are mighty rare, perhaps in the present age *non-entities*. There may, in days of yore, have been some pious souls who had more good works about them than were barely necessary for their own salvation ; and why

\* Among others, by the Prelate already mentioned ; who is severely handled for it by the anonymous author of *Serious and Candid Observations*, just now published ; who labours to prove that the Seventeenth Article of the Church of England is pure Calvinism : and indeed, in my apprehension, it will be hard to extract from it any thing else.

they

they might not communicate the surplus to their friends, who were not quite so rich as themselves, I really see no good reason. The *belief*, that *they might*, has, at least, no evil in it; and seems rather to be founded on *fraternal charity*. But I greatly fear, as I said before, that this fraternal charity is rarely practicable; and that the far greater part of Christians, of Catholic Christians, have need of all the *good works*, they do, to entitle them, *immediately*, to a seat on the celestial benches: and it is well if they can obtain for them an *intermediate* station in

#### PURGATORY:

Another Roman Catholic tenet, which smells ill in the noses of Protestants; and is ranked by the framers of the English Articles among “fond things:” and very justly in my opinion, if the word *fond* be taken in its genuine original acceptation\*; for, would it not be a *desirable*

\* Johnson “found no satisfactory etymology” for this word: but if he had been acquainted with the

able thing, that there did exist a Purgatory; to purge away the imperfections which the best of us, I fear, carry to the grave, and which, although they may not merit the pains of Hell, may yet be obstacles to immediate admission to the joys of Heaven? Whether this *fond fancy* be “grounded upon no warranty of Scripture, but rather repugnant to God’s word\*,” is a question that has been plausibly debated; and which I leave to be still debated by those who choose it: I will only say, that the belief of a Purgatory is a very harmless belief, was a pretty early belief in the Christian Churches, and is not incompatible with any other Article of Catholic credence.—On the belief of a Purgatory is founded the practice of

#### PRAYING FOR THE DEAD:

Another of our Tenets, which is repro-  
 Celtic dialects, he would have had no hesitation. *Fonn* signifies *delight—pleasure—longing*: *folly* is but a secondary idea, arising from excess of *fondness*; yet Johnson makes it the primary acceptance.

\* Art. 22.

bated



bated by Protestants ; and which, indeed, must stand or fall with Purgatory. It will not however be denied, I think, that, *if* a Purgatory *do* exist, (and it has never yet been proved, that it *may not* exist) it surely cannot but be a pious wish, that the pains of those who suffer in it could be mitigated : and our addressing our humble prayers and supplications to the all-merciful God, for that purpose, can never be deemed any other than a charitable, a pious practice.—Is it possible for those who believe at all another Life, not to follow, in mind, their departed friends, and exclaim or breathe : *May they rest in peace !*—

When the dying mother of Austin requested her son to remember her at the Altar of the Lord, could his filial piety refuse to his deceased parent so tender a request ? No ; he fails not to pray to God for her in a manner so pathetic and melting, that I defy any one who reads him to refrain from weeping ; if his heart be not a heart of stone, and his eyes eyes of adamant \*.

I am

\* “ Ego itaque, Laus mea et vita mea ! Deus cor-

I am not ignorant, that the practice of praying for the dead is liable to abuses, has been abused ; and that a number of scholastic and monkish innovations have tended to make the Doctrine disgusting : such as *Indulgences for the Souls in Purgatory, Venal Dirges, Pompous Obits, Privileged Altars* : all the inventions of latter times, and rapidly falling into disrepute. The total disuse of them will soon follow.—I pass from *praying for the Dead*, who are supposed to be not yet in Heaven ;

“dis mei, repositis paulisper bonis ejus actibus, pro  
 “quibus tibi gaudens gratias ago, nunc pro peccatis matris meæ deprecor te : exaudi me per medicinam vulnerum nostrorum quæ pependit in ligno, et sedens  
 “ad dexteram tuam te interpellat pro nobis. Scio, misericorditer operatam et ex corde dimisisse debita debitoribus suis : dimitte illi et Tu debita sua, si qua etiam  
 “contraxit per tot annos post aquam salutis : dimitte, Domine ; dimitte, obsecro : ne intres cum ea in iudicium . . . Nemo a protectione tua dirumpat eam : non  
 “se interponant, nec vi nec insidiis leo et draco : neque enim respondebit illa *nihil se debere*, ne vincatur et  
 “obteneatur ab accusatore callido : sed respondebit dimissa debita sua ab eo, cui nemo reddet quod pro nobis, non debens, reddidit. Sit ergo in pace, cum  
 “viro,

ven; to praying to those who are already there;—

THE INVOCATION OF SAINTS :

The abjuration of which is, together with that of Transubstantiation, required to be made in the Test- Act; and which, in the already quoted Article of the English Confession of Faith, is ranked with Purgatory among “the fond and vainly invented things.” What sort of *Apology* can I make for this tenet?—If it be not satisfactory, it shall at least be short. I confess, the in-

“viro, ante quem nulli, et post quem nulli nupta est;  
 “cui servivit, fructum tibi afferens in tolerantia ut eum  
 “quoque lucraretur tibi. Et inspira, Domine Deus  
 “meus! inspira servis tuis fratribus meis, filiis tuis  
 “dominis meis, quibus et voce, et corde, et literis ser-  
 “vio, ut quotquot hæc legerint, meminerint ad altare  
 “tuum *Monice* famulæ tuæ, cum *Patricio* quondam  
 “ejus conjuge, per quorum carnem introduxisti me in  
 “hanc vitam; quem ad modum nescio—Meminerint  
 “cum affectu pio *parentum meorum* in hac luce transi-  
 “toria; ut quod a me *illa* [mater] poposcit extremum,  
 “uberius ei præstetur in multorum orationibus, tam per  
 “confessiones, quam per orationes meas.” *Confess.*  
 lib. ix. c. 13.—Did ever filial piety appear to greater  
 advantage?

vocation



vocation of Saints is “grounded upon no  
 “warranty of Scripture:” but I find no  
 Text in Scripture that *unwarrants it*. It  
 appears to be founded on a very natural  
 presumption; namely, that our friends and  
 brethren, who have gone before us to those  
 blessed regions, to which we all aspire,  
 are still solicitous about our welfare, and  
 pray for our happiness to our common  
 God and Father; and, consequently, it  
 can be no impiety in us to request their  
 prayers; any more than it is to request the  
 prayers of our fellow-men with whom  
 we live, and who are in the same state  
 of probation and expectancy as ourselves.  
 From the highest saints in heaven, we look  
 for nothing more than their bare interces-  
 sion in our behalf; and this only because  
 we deem their intercession more worthy of  
 attention than our own imperfect supplica-  
 tions.—But is not this *intercession* injurious  
 to the *mediatorship* of Jesus Christ? We  
 answer, No. The mediatorship of Christ  
 is of a very different nature, and of a singu-  
 lar kind: whereas the intercession of the  
 Saints is of the very same nature with that  
 which

which we make for one another; which Abraham made for Abimelech\*, Moses for his sister†, and Job for his three friends‡.

But what say I to so many *direct* addresses made to the Saints, and particularly to the Virgin Mary, for grace, mercy, and salvation; which are so common in our old Primers and Prayer-books; and of which some still remain in our reformed Breviaries? I say that they are the wild effusions of superstitious folly, and ought to be expunged, wheresoever they are found: and as they have been pretty faithfully collected by the Protestant Author of *Reflections upon the Devotions of Roman Catholics*, let the whole collection be committed to the flames: and I will venture to say, that no English Catholic will pluck a single leaf out of the fire.—Akin to the *Invocation* of Saints, is the veneration paid to their

#### RELICS AND IMAGES;

Which is considered by Protestants as a

\* Gen. xx. 17. † Numb. xiii. 13. ‡ Job xlii. 8, 9.

species of *Idolatry* ; by Roman Catholics, only as a piece of *Respect* due to the mortal remains, and visible representations, of holy Personages ; similar to that which we show to the ashes and pictures of our departed Parents, and Friends. If the veneration for Relics or Images have ever gone beyond this (which, I am sorry to say, it hath), it was contrary to the Doctrine of Catholic Christianity, and ought to be universally exploded : as, I firmly believe, it is exploded by every British Catholic. Images and Pictures were first introduced into Churches for the instruction of the ignorant in the history of Holy Writ, and of the lives of Holy Persons ; but the superstitious Orientalists soon abused the practice ; and the second Council of Nice gave a sanction to this abuse, by establishing a sort of *Image-worship* which really seems to touch on Idolatry ; and which was severely condemned by the Council of Frankfort ; although defended by Pope Adrian.

How different the conduct of his predecessor Gregory I. ! to whose Doctrine,



I am persuaded, every Roman Catholic of the present day will cheerfully subscribe. This Pope, in a Letter to Serenus Bishop of Marseilles, whose zeal against Image-worship (which then was beginning to be popular) made him break the Images and throw them out of the Churches, writes thus : “ We commend your zeal for having prevented any thing made by hands from being adored : but we think you ought not to have broken those Images\*.” And in another Letter to the same : “ If any one will make Images, forbid him not : but by all means shun the adoring of them. Let your fraternity carefully admonish *the people*, that from the sight of such representations they should conceive a warm compunction; and humbly prostrate themselves in the adoration of the omnipotent holy Trinity alone†.”—

To

\* *Et quidem zelum vos, ne quid manufactum adorari possit, habuisse, laudavimus; sed frangere easdem imagines non debuisse judicamus.*

† *Et si quis imagines facere voluerit, minime prohibe: adorare vero imagines, omnibus modis evita. Sed hoc sollicite*

To this quotation from a Roman Bishop, I shall add one from an English writer of the Protestant persuasion extremely similar to it : “ It has distasted some, that *respect* “ and *honour* should be given to the “ Images of Christ. Strange, it should “ displease any, that can approve of any, “ be it but a civil, use of them ! I cannot “ tell—unless men would instantly have “ them pulled down in all places, demo- “ lished, stamped to powder ; whosoever, “ whatsoever, wheresoever. The setting of “ them up, suffering them to stand, using “ them for ornaments, for helps of me- “ mory, of affection, of remembrance, “ cannot, to my understanding, be ab- “ stracted from reverence and honour, “ simply, and in due kind. Can a man “ have the true representation of his “ Prince, Parents, Patrons, &c. without “ awe, respect, regard, love, reverence, “ moved by aspect, and wrought in him ?

*licite Fraternitas tua admoneat, ut ex visione rei gestæ ardorem compunctionis percipiant ; et in adoratione solius omnipotentis sanctæ Trinitatis humiliter prosternantur.*

“ I pro-

"I profess my *imperfection*, or what they  
 "will call it: but so it is with me \*."—  
 And so it is with *me*—even if it should be  
 called *Idolatry*!—As to the opinions of  
 our Schoolmen on this subject, from *Thomas Aquinas* down to *Philip de Gamache* †,  
 they are given up as absurd, and in some  
 sense impious, by all the enlightened Ca-  
 tholics of the present day.—And now,  
 again, O candid Protestant reader! say,  
 if this regard and veneration which we

\* Montague. *Appeal to Caesar*, ch. xxi.

† A famous Doctor of the Sorbonne; who taught  
 that the Cross and Image of Christ, as they repre-  
 sent him, ought to be worshipped with the supreme  
 worship of *Latria*; because Christ himself is the rea-  
 son of the adoration; and because the Church so  
 worships the Cross in her hymn "O Crux, ave, spes  
 "unica," &c.—Although this cannot be the meaning  
 of that hymn, it would be better to eject it out of  
 the Missal, and at the same time give up the custom of  
 what is called the *Adoration of the Cross* on Good Fri-  
 day; which in some places is already disused, and will,  
 it is to be hoped, soon become obsolete. The very ap-  
 pearances of Superstition should be done away. There  
 are many things in the Roman Pontifical of this kind;  
 which stand in need of excision or reformation.

have



have for the Images of Christ and of his Saints, or for their precious remains, be *Idolatry* \*, or deserving of civil proscription? or that the *abjuration* of it should be made a condition of our re-entering into the full possession of British Freedom?

My Apology has, hitherto, regarded ei-

\* It grieves me to be obliged to notice, here, an injustice done to us by Protestant writers, some of whom might be supposed to know better. They tell us, that in order to justify *Image worship*, we throw out the *Second Commandment*; and, to keep up the number, divide the Tenth into two: and this ridiculous assertion is repeated in a late publication already mentioned, *Elements of Christian Theology*, vol. ii. p. 355, Note. If these Gentlemen had said that we divide the Commandments differently, with St. Austin, they would have said the truth. We join to what is called the *First* in the Protestant division the *Second*, as immediately connected with it; and divide the Tenth into two, because coveting a neighbour's *wife*, and coveting his *goods*, seem to be as different as *stealth* and *adultery*. Whether this division be better or worse than the other, I will not say: but still there is no part of the Commandments left out. The *First*, indeed, is sometimes shortened, with an *&c.*: as two others are sometimes abridged in the same manner: *Honour thy Father and Mother, &c.* *Remember to keep holy the Sabbath Day, &c.*

ther

ther Articles of Belief, or Practices connected with them. What remains chiefly concerns Points of Discipline, which have varied, and may vary again, without any detriment to Religion or Catholicity. I shall begin by

THE CELIBACY OF THE CLERGY:

On which I shall be as brief as possible.—  
In the first place, I subscribe to these words of the 32d Article of the Church of England: “Bishops, Priests and Deacons are  
“not commanded by God’s law either to  
“vow the estate of a single life or to ab-  
“stain from marriage\*.” This is not the question between the two Churches: but there is a double controversy between them: namely, whether vows of celibacy be at all lawful? and whether such vows ought to be *imposed* on the Clergy?—  
There are some who think, that vows of perpetual continency are, in their very nature, *unlawful*. If they had called them *unnatural*, perhaps they would not have

\* So Gratian. “Copula sacerdotalis nec legali, nec  
“evangelica vel apostolica auctoritate prohibetur.”  
Gaus. 26. Qu. 2.

been far from the truth ; but to say that they are absolutely *unlawful*, appears to be too strong an expression. If Virginitv be at all lawfully *practised*, one should think it may be lawfully *vowed* : although, for many obvious reasons, a voluntary unwowed Virginitv seems preferable.—However, let us suppose that there is nothing unlawful in making a vow of perpetual Celibacy, it may still be questioned whether such a vow can with justice be imposed on any class of mankind by any human authority, even that of the Church. It certainly was not imposed for several centuries, although it began at an early period to be extravagantly praised, and recommended as a state far superior to that of marriage ; an approximation to the life of angels ! To debase the dignity of marriage, and extol the merits of a single life, was the common topic of eloquence, particularly in the Western Churches : where marriage was decried as a defilement unbecoming the Ministers of the Altar ; and the conjugal act deemed a sufficient reason to exclude, *pro tempore*,  
even



even the Laity themselves from communion. Tertullian, the Montanist Tertullian, was the father of this doctrine, and Jerom was its great foster-father; some of whose reveries on the subject the reader will see below\*.

The Greek Fathers, although loud in the praise of Virginity, hold a very different language with respect to Marriage. Origen, I think, is the only exception.—But Origen learned not this doctrine from his great master, Clement of Alexandria, who in many parts of his *Stromata*, with a zeal truly prudent and apostolical, defends the sanctity of Marriage against the Encratites; fairly balances the respective advantages of that state and Virginity; and

\* “ *Si bonum est mulierem non tangere, malum est ergo tangere; nihil enim bono contrarium, nisi malum. . .*  
 “ *Si autem malum est et ignoscitur, ideo conceditur, ne malo quid deterius fiat. . .* Quamdiu impleo mariti  
 “ officium, non impleo continentis [other copies have  
 “ ‘Christiani’] . . . Jubeat Apostolus, ut semper oremus:  
 “ si semper orandum est, nunquam ergo conjugio servandum:  
 “ quoniam, quotiescunque uxori debitum reddo, orare non possum.” *Advers. Jovin.* l. i. tom. iv. pars ii. p. 149, 150, ed. Bened.

shows that, in certain respects and circumstances, the former may be the more perfect state of the two. I shall quote only two passages from this early and orthodox Father; referring my learned readers to the originals below. "Marriage, as well  
 " as Celibacy, has its peculiar offices and  
 " duties, with respect to God: I mean the  
 " care of children and of a wife . . . hence  
 " the Apostle says, that those ought to be  
 " chosen Bishops, who, from the proper  
 " care of their own families, have learn-  
 " ed to govern an whole Church: let  
 " every one therefore, according to his vo-  
 " cation, perform his own duty, that, free  
 " in Christ, he may obtain his respective re-  
 " ward \*."—And in another place, speak-  
 ing of Christian perfection, he says, That a  
 man may be perfect in marriage as well

\* Εχει γαρ, ὡς περ ἡ εὐνουχία, ἑνὼ καὶ ὁ γάμος ἰδίας λει-  
 τουργίας καὶ διακονίας, τῷ Κυρίῳ διαφερούσας· τέκνων λεγώ  
 κηδεσθαι καὶ γυναικὸς . . . αὐτίκα, φησὶν, ἐπισκοποὺς δεῖ κατ-  
 ἰστασθαι τοὺς ἐκ τῆς ἰδίου οἰκῆς καὶ τῆς ἐκκλησίας ἀπάσης προ-  
 ἴστασθαι μελετήσαντας· ἕκαστος οὐ γὰρ ἐν ᾧ ἐκλήθη ἐργῶ τῇ διακονίᾳ  
 ἐκτελεῖτω, ἵνα ἐλευθερὸς ἐν Χριστῷ γένηται, τὸν οἰκεῖον τῆς δια-  
 κονίας ἀπολαμβάνων μισθόν. Strom. lib. iii. p. 459, ed. Sylb.

as in a single life; having the Apostles themselves for his patterns: “and truly, “ (adds he) a man approves not himself by “ choosing a single life: but HE, who, with- “ out lasciviousness or anxiety, performs “ the duties of matrimony by the procrea- “ tion of children and the care of his “ household—and who, notwithstanding “ the care of his household, is insepa- “ rable from the love of God, and resists “ every temptation that may arise from “ wife, children, or family—he surpasses “ the rest of men\*.” I doubt if any thing has been better said on the subject: and it would have been well if posterior writers had written with the same temper.

But the notions of Tertullian and Je-  
rom generally prevailed: marriage was

† Το γάμειν δὲ, εἰς ὃ λόγος ἐστὶν, λέγω, καὶ ὡς καθήκει· γενο-  
μενός γὰρ τελείος, εἰκότως ἔχει τοὺς Ἀποστόλους· καὶ, τῷ ὄντι,  
ἀνὴρ οὐκ ἐν τῷ μονήρῳ ἐπανελεσθαι δείκνυται βίον, ἀλλ’ ἐκείνος ἀν-  
δρᾶς νικά, ὁ γάμω, καὶ παιδοποιῶ, καὶ τῇ τοῦ οἴκου προνοίᾳ,  
ἀσθονῶς τε καὶ ἀλυπητῶς ἐβγυμνάσμενος, μετὰ τῆς τοῦ οἴκου  
κηδεμονίας, ἀδιατάτος τῆς τοῦ Θεοῦ γενομένης ἀγάπης, καὶ πάσης  
ἡπτεξάντιστος πείρας, τῆς διὰ τέκνων, καὶ γυναικός, οἰκετῶν  
τε καὶ κτημάτων προσφερομένης. Ib. lib. vii. p. 741.



depreciated, and married Priests held in so much difesteem, that some would not take the Communion from their profane hands, nor be baptized by them,—The broacher of this Doctrine was Eustathius \*, an Armenian Bishop, and the founder of *Monachism* in that country ; who, by the number of his followers, excited great disturbances ; which was the cause of the meeting of the Council of Gangra, in which were made several Canons against the vituperators of marriage ; and, among others, the following one : “ If any one separate himself from a married Priest, as if it were unlawful to communicate when he officiates, let him be Anathema†.” The Ca-

\* Pinytus, Bishop of Crete, had, indeed, as early as 170, under pretence of greater purity, attempted to impose celibacy on his Clergy : but the celebrated Dionysius, Bishop of Corinth, wrote to him so strongly against that measure, that Pinytus “ embraced (says Rufinus) the opinion of his better counsel.” See *Euseb. Hist. Eccles.* l. iv. c. 23.

† Εἰ τις διακρινοῖτο παρὰ πρεσβυτέρου ὑγιαμῆκατος, ὡς μὴ χρῆναι, λειτουργήσαντος αὐτοῦ, προσφοράς μεταλαμβάνειν, ἀνάθεμα ἔστω. Can. iv. Labbe, tom. ii. p. 419.

nons

nons of this Council were approved by that of Trullo, otherwise called the *Quinisext*; as late as 692.

In the fifth of the Canons called *Apostolical*, Bishops, Priests, and Deacons are expressly forbidden to put away their wives, even on pretence of religion; under the penalty of degradation\*.—If the ambiguous Canon of the Council of Elvira [*Illiberis*] be rendered grammatically, it will be equivalent to this Canon; for thus it runs; “Placuit in totum *prohiberi* Episcopis, Presbyteris et Diaconibus, vel omnibus Clericis, positis in ministerio, *abstinere* se a conjugibus suis et non generare filios: Quicumque vero fecerit, ab honore Clericatus exterminetur.” But as the Latin of those Iberian Fathers is none of the best, it has been supposed that they meant quite the contrary of what appears to be their meaning; and that *prohiberi* is here equivalent to *juberi*!—in which case they forbid Bishops, Priests,

\* Επισκοπος, η πρεσβυτερος, η διακονος, την εαυτης γυναικα μη εκβαλλειτω προφασει ευλαβειας: εαν δε εκβαλη, αφοριζεται απεμεινων δε, καθαιρεσθω. Apud Coteler. ed. Clerici, tom. i. p. 442.

Deacons, the whole Clergy, to abstain from their wives and procreation while they are placed in the ministry, *positis in ministerio*; yet no other penalty is annexed but that of *degradation*.

The same degradation is decreed by the Council of Neocesarea in 314\*.—A similar Decree had been passed that same year in the Council of Ancyra with respect to *Deacons* †; and, if we can trust Aristenus ‡, to *Priests* also. But in this Decree it is remarkable, that the degradation affected only those Deacons, who, at the time of their ordination, neglected to protest against the observation of celibacy: for, if they did then protest, and afterwards married, they might still remain in the ministry.

In the great Council of Nice a proposal, it appears, was made to forbid the marriage of the Clergy; but this was so strenuously opposed by Paphnutius that the point was

\* Προσβυτερος ιαν γαμν, της ταξως αυτον μετατιθισθαι.  
Can. i. apud Labbe, tom. i. p. 1480.

† See Can. x. apud Labbe, tom. i. p. 1460.

‡ Who, in his Comment on the 6th Can. of the Quinisext Council, reads in the Canon of Ancyra, *διανοι, η προσβυτεροι*.



given up.—But as at that time many of the unmarried Clergy kept females in their houses, who were called *introduets*, συνεισ-  
ακται—and with whom they lived in a familiarity almost connubial, the Synod made a Canon, forbidding Bishops, Priests, Deacons, or any other of the Clergy, to have any such *introduets* in their houses; save mothers, sisters or aunts; or at least persons beyond all suspicion\*.”

In the East, matters remained in this state until the *Quinisext* Council, in 692; in which a Canon was made prohibiting the *use of marriage* to Bishops after their ordination: which was then practised in Africa and Libya, even by some *most religious Prelates*, θεοφιλας αἱ Προεδροι; at which, it seems, the people were scandalized. To remove this stumbling-block, the Fathers of the *Quinisext* Council (which was only a

\* Απηγορευσε καθολου ἡ μεγαλη συνδος, μητε επισκοπω, μητε πρεσβυτερω, μητε διακωνω, μητε ολως τινι τω κληρω, εξειναι συνεισακτην εχειν· πλην ει μη αρα μητερα, η αδελφη, η θειαν, η α μονα προσωπα πασαν υποψιαν διαπεφυγε. Can. iii, Labbe, tom. ii. p. 29.

continuation of the *fifth* and *sixth* Synods of Constantinople) decree that no such usage shall, in future, be permitted; and that all such Bishops shall be deposed\*: but with regard to the inferior Clergy, they provide by a special Canon, or rather a renewal of the third Canon of the Fifth Council of Carthage; that the free use and enjoyment of marriage shall be left them. As this Canon has ever since regulated the conduct of the Greek and other Eastern Churches, my readers will, perhaps, be pleased to find a translation of it here.

\* A voluntary abstinence from the use of marriage had already become common among the Oriental Bishops; owing chiefly to this, that they were generally taken out of Monasteries; as they are at this day. It is remarkable, that the Fathers of the Quinisext Council allow that their Canon is contrary to prior Apostolical regulations; from which they say they mean not to derogate: but they think that the greater good of the people and the Ecclesiastical dignity require this new regulation. Τοῦτο δὲ φάμεν, οὐκ ἐπ' ἀβηθήσει ἡ ἀνατροφή τῶν ἀποστολικῶς προγενομοθετημένων· ἀλλὰ τῆς σωτηρίας καὶ προκοπῆς τῆς ἐπὶ τὸ κρεῖττον τῶν λαῶν προμηθευμένοι, καὶ τοῦ μὴ δοῦναι μῦρον τίνα κατὰ τῆς ἱερατικῆς καταστάσεως. Can xii. apud Labbe, tom. vi. p. 1147.

“Whereas

“ Whereas we understand, that, in the  
 “ Church of the Romans, it is prescribed  
 “ in the form of a Canon, that those who  
 “ are to be dignified with the Order of  
 “ Deacon or of Priest must profess that they  
 “ will no more converse with their wives :  
 “ We, following the antient Canon of Apo-  
 “ stolic exactitude and order, will, that the  
 “ lawful cohabitation of the sacred Mini-  
 “ sters cease not to be henceforth valid :  
 “ not daring to dissolve the union between  
 “ them and their wives, or to deprive  
 “ either of mutual conversation on proper  
 “ occasions : So that, if any one be found  
 “ worthy to be ordained a Sub-Deacon,  
 “ Deacon, or Priest ; let him by no means  
 “ be excluded from any of these degrees,  
 “ for cohabiting with his lawful wife. Nor  
 “ shall he be desired, at the time of his or-  
 “ dination, to declare that he will abstain  
 “ from a lawful matrimonial commerce ;  
 “ lest we should thereby be unavoidably  
 “ injurious to marriage, which God or-  
 “ dained, and blessed with his own pre-  
 “ sence ; the evangelical voice having pro-  
 “ nounced



“ nounced this sentence, *What God hath*  
 “ *joined together, let no man put asunder ;*  
 “ and the Apostle teaching that *marriage*  
 “ *is honourable ; and the bed undefiled ;* and  
 “ again : *Art thou bound to a wife ? seek*  
 “ *not to be loosed . . . .* If, therefore, any  
 “ one shall, against the Apostolical Ca-  
 “ nons, presume to deprive the Clergy (we  
 “ mean Priests, Deacons, and Subdeacons)  
 “ of a lawful conjunction with their wives ;  
 “ let him be deposed \*.” — This is a  
 most sensible Decree : which, as I have  
 said, has been religiously observed ever  
 since by the Oriental Churches.

But it fared not so with the Churches of  
 the West. For, although until about the  
 end of the fourth age, the Celibacy of  
 the Clergy had not been enforced by any  
 Ecclesiastical Constitution, yet it had gain-  
 ed a wonderful veneration in the opinions  
 of mankind ; which made way for the  
 public imposition of it. This was first  
 attempted by Siricius (in 385), who, in  
 his Letter to Himerius Bishop of Tarra-

\* See the Original : apud Labbe, tom. loco citato.

gon, after a long declamation against clerical marriages, commands *Priests* and *Deacons* to abstain from the company of their wives, upon pain of deposition from their offices\*. Innocent I. renewed and confirmed the Constitution of Siricius†. Leo I. went a step further, and included Subdeacons in the prohibition: and ever since Subdeacons have been forbidden the use of marriage in the Roman Church.—In the year 506, the Council of Agatha adopted the Constitutions of Siricius and Leo.—The Second Council of Toledo‡ required a *previous vow* of continence of those who were to be ordained Subdeacons; the first instance of the kind, I believe, that occurs in the history of the Church.—The Council of Clermont, in 535, complain, that, notwithstanding the former prohibitions, many Priests and Deacons had used

\* Apud Labbe, tom. ii. p. 1017, &c.

† If his Epistles to Victricius and Exuperius be not spurious, as some learned men think.

‡ It was a Synod of eight Bishops only. See Labbe, tom. iv. p. 1734.

the company of their wives and begotten children of them : all such are commanded to be *degraded* from their office.—In 541, the Fourth Council of Orleans orders that “ Priests or Deacons shall not have  
 “ a common cell or bed with their wives ;  
 “ lest the very suspicion of carnal conver-  
 “ sation should throw a blot upon their re-  
 “ ligious \*.” The reader who wishes to see more such Canons may consult the Councils marked below †.

Nothing, I think, can be a stronger proof than the persevering reluctance with which the Clergy submitted to those various and repeated Decrees, that the Decrees themselves were harsh, unnatural, and ineffectual. Nay, they defeated the very pur-

\* Can. 17. Labbe, tom. v. p. 384.

† The Fifth of Orleans, in 549, Can. 14.—Of Auxerre, in 578.—First of Mafcon, in 581.—The Third of Lyons, in 583.—The Fourth of Toledo, in 633.—The Eighth of Toledo, in 653.—Of Worms, in 868—with several others, which may be seen in the 6th, 7th, 8th, and 9th volumes of Labbe's Councils.



pose for which they were made\*; for, what was the consequence? Concubinage, and crimes worse than concubinage which I will not name. The mellifluous Bernard shall speak for me in his own language :  
 “ Tolle de Ecclesia honorabile connubium  
 “ et thorum immaculatum ; nonne reple  
 “ eam concubinariis, incestuosis, semini-  
 “ fluis, mollibus, masculorum concubitori-  
 “ bus, et omni denique genere immundo-  
 “ rum ? Elige ergo utrumlibet ; aut sal-  
 “ vari universa monstra hæc hominum, aut  
 “ numerum salvandorum ad continentium  
 “ redige *paucitatem*. Quam *parcus* in  
 “ uno ! quam *largus* in altero ! . . . *Rara*  
 “ *in terris Continentia*, neque pro tantillo

\* “ Human laws, made to direct the will, should  
 “ give precepts, and not counsels. Religion, made to  
 “ direct the heart, ought to give many counsels, and  
 “ few precepts. Celibacy was advised by Christianity :  
 “ when they made it a *law* in respect to a certain order  
 “ of men, it became necessary to make *new ones every*  
 “ day, in order to oblige those men to observe it. The  
 “ Legislator wearied himself, and he wearied society, to  
 “ make men perform by precept, what those who love  
 “ perfection would have performed as counsel.” *Mont-*  
*esquieu, Spirit of Laws*, book xxiv. ch. 7.

"quæstu ad terras plenitudo illa [Salva-  
toris] semetipsum exinanivit \*."

Still, hitherto, there was one redress : the Clergyman who married, was in general only degraded from his rank ; but liable to no other penalty. It was reserved for the same Despot-Pontiff, who trampled on the necks of Kings, to impose on the Clergy of the Western Churches that yoke of absolute celibacy which still galls them ; and which the Protestant Churches, at the Reformation, did well to throw off. The violent declamations of our Theologians against that measure are pitiful in the extreme : they are all answered by one short sentence of an Apostle : " It is better to marry than to burn."—It was, indeed, more a piece of policy in the Church of Rome to detach the Clergy from the rest of mankind, and attach them to its own interests, than a wish to enforce true Christian purity, that begot all those severe laws against the marriage of the Clergy ; laws,

\* Serm. 66. in Cantica, tom. i. p. 1498, edit. 2. Mabill.

which

which every candid Catholic must, I think, acknowledge to be tyrannical, and every pious Catholic wish to see repealed. If the Church of Rome will persevere in admitting *boys* of 22 years into Holy Orders, and insist on their celibacy from that moment, let her at least return to a more ancient, although not an Apostolic Discipline: let degradation from office be the only penalty; and let the Clergyman who shall marry be reduced to Lay Communion; but without any note of infamy on that account\*. This, in my humble opinion, is the only expedient that can reconcile clerical celibacy with common sense, and secure the purity of the officiating Clergy, without compulsion. I could say much more on this very important subject: but I promised to be as brief as possible; and fear, that it will be thought by some that I have already been too prolix. Yet I

\* In this case, they would be in a similar situation with our *Fellows of Colleges*; who, when they marry, must give up their fellowship.



have still a word or two more to say.—For it still remains to be inquired, whether the Celibacy, the perpetual Celibacy, of our Clergy be dangerous to the State? or hurtful to Society? To the former of these questions I answer negatively: as I cannot conceive any hurt which the State has to dread from a set of unmarried men living under its protection.—To the second I must make a distinction. In some countries the Celibacy of the Clergy has been, and still is, more or less hurtful to Society; in as far as it has contributed to the depopulation of kingdoms, and fostered a selfish abalienation from the duties of domestic life, and social reciprocity: not to mention other evils that have sprung from an enormous multiplication of an idle, and too often dissolute Clergy: especially after Monachism, abandoning its primitive retreat and hard labour in the desert, rushed into cities and villages under the clerical profession, to enjoy in ease and indolence, often in luxury, the fruits of an impolitic

politic and ill-placed charity. And this leads me to say a few words on

MONKS, FRIARS, NUNS, ETC.

I group all these together, because they owe their establishment to nearly the same causes, and are connected by similar ties. Now it may be asked, what I have to advance in their favour? I confess, I have not much; and the little I have, will, I fear, seem but little satisfactory to most Protestants. However, let us just see what can be said in their behalf.—And,

In the first place, it may not be improper to trace their origin. This some fanciful writers have found in the *Mosaic Nazarites*, or *Netbenim*: but the sole resemblance between these and our Monks is, that they both pretended to lead a more sanctified life, and to observe a more rigorous discipline, than the rest of mankind.—In the New Testament these words of Christ: “If thou wilt be perfect, go! sell “what thou hast; and come! follow me,” Matt. xix. 21. have been supposed to authorize

thorize *vows* of poverty taken by our Religious Orders :—and these other words : “ There are Eunuchs, who have made themselves Eunuchs for the kingdom of Heaven’s sake,” &c. ch. xix. 12. are applied to monastic vows of chastity.—But in neither of these passages is there any word of *vows* : nor indeed do we find, either in the Acts of the Apostles or in any of their Epistles, the smallest shadow of modern Monachism.

The first Monk \* or Hermit was a certain Paul of the Lower Thebais, in Egypt, who flying from the persecution of Decius and Valerian, shut himself up in a cave in the Upper Thebais ; where he led a *monachal*, that is a *solitary*, life for the space of sixty years ; and who, according to Jerom’s Legend, was, like Elijah, every day fed by a raven.—But the great Father of *Monachism*, or more properly *Cænobitism*,

\* The word comes from the Greek *μοναχος* ; one who lives alone. He was called an Hermit (it should be *Eremita*) from living in a desert ; the Greek word is *ερημιτης* ; but our present *Monks* are neither *μοναχοι* nor *ερημιται*.

was



was Antony ; who losing both his parents at the age of seventeen, and hearing read in the Church the words of Jesus Christ above quoted, *If thou wilt be perfect, &c.* distributed all his goods and possessions among his neighbours, and retired into the desert about the year 270. He died at the age of 105; after having peopled the deserts of Egypt with a great number of monasteries, or *cænobia*, in which the cœnobites practised mortifications and self-denial to a pitch of enthusiasm almost beyond credibility. His life was written by the famous Athanasius ; which the reader, if he choose, may see in the works of that Father, if it indeed be his.—Pachomius followed the steps of Antony, and had 5000 monks under his direction ! His sister founded a monastery for women.

Monachism had hitherto been confined to Egypt : but it was transplanted into Syria by Hilarion, and into Greece by Basil. But the Monks, or Cœnobites, of those days were neither *Clergymen* nor *Idlers*.

They were generally Lay-men, who earned their scanty meals in the sweat of their brow ; and were *troublesome* to none but *themselves*. Their mortifications were indeed excessive ; and superstition often mixed itself among their devotions : but still they were not hurtful ; except in as far as they tended to thin population ; and, sometimes, relinquished domestic duties, which it would have been more *christian* as well as more *social* to have performed.

Into the Western Church Monachism was introduced by Benedict ; who, after living some years the life of an Hermit, founded his Order at *Monte-Cassino* about the year 529. This was the only Monastic Institution in Europe, for many years : and, would to God, it had remained the only one ! It may be said to be the only one that hath done the most good blended with the least evil. The Rules of Benedict are drawn up with prudence, and without any singular austerity : and his Order has produced a considerable number of learned  
men

men and useful members of society \*. The little learning that remained in the dark ages was preserved by them; and they had at least a greater share of genuine piety than their Lay or Clerical contemporaries: until affluence begot luxury, and luxury licentiousness. Reforms, it is true, were, from to time, made; and the most crying abuses corrected: but still their great riches were a source of many evils, which has brought, or is speedily about to bring, their utter abolition. To the reformed Congregation of St. Maurus we owe so much, that one cannot help wishing it had been excluded from the general ruin. Yet, still, the Church of Christ can do as well without them, as it did for five whole centuries before they existed: and per-

\* The Benedictines boast, that their Order has given 40 Popes, 50 Patriarchs, 200 Cardinals, 1600 Archbishops, 4600 Bishops, 4 Emperors, 46 Kings, and 3600 Canonized Saints! There may be exaggeration in all this: but the truth is certain, that they have very often filled the highest offices in Church and State; and have commonly discharged those offices to advantage.



haps, if the good and evil which they have done were fairly balanced, it would be hard to say which of the scales preponderated.

As to the other Religious Orders, who spawned so thick in posterior ages, it would, perhaps, have been better that they had never existed. At least I, for one, heartily wish that they had never existed; as the portion of harm, which they have done to the Christian world, far exceeds, in my estimation, the portion of good which they have *occasionally* operated. Were I to make any exception, it would be in favour of that Hermaphroditical\* Order, the Jesuits. This Order has produced many good classical Scholars, excellent Mathematicians, eloquent Preachers, learned Antiquaries, and elegant La-

\* I call them an *Hermaphroditical Order*; because, according to their own account, they were neither *Monks* nor *Friars*, but a medley of both; and enjoying all the privileges granted by Popes to both; with some privileges peculiar to themselves. See a work entitled *Institutum Societatis Jesu*, &c. printed at Prague in 1757.

time

fin \* Poets ; some few good Historians, and three or four tolerable Scripture Commentators ; but their lax, versatile casuistry, their secret and intriguing policy, their peculiar *esprit-de-corps* ; and above all their servile obsequiousness and devotion to the See of Rome, deserved the fate which they ultimately met with ; although very ungratefully inflicted upon them by the *Bishop of Rome*, whose *Infallibility* they had been labouring to establish or consolidate for more than a couple of centuries !

On the whole, Religious Orders of any stamp or denomination are not essential to Christianity ; and may be abolished by any Christian Government which may deem them pernicious, or useless, to Society : although, at the same time, I think, justice seems to require that their proscription should be gradual and negative ; that is, that their present race (being like the first

\* I say *Latin* Poets : because I cannot recollect a single Vernacular Poem of any note, written by a Jesuit, except some pieces by Gresset.

people of Rome a race of males only) should be allowed to finish their natural course in peace ; care being taken to prevent the perpetuation of the species by new recruits.

With respect to Nuns, I am at a loss what to say. If their vows were only conditional, and their retirement at pleasure, as is the case with some religious communities in Germany, I think the institution might not only be permitted, but in some measure encouraged. Women disgusted with the world, or disappointed in their views, will always be glad of such a retreat ; especially if they might leave it when they please, and return to the world without any disgrace being annexed to their deserting their profession.

With regard to Britain, the laws have sufficiently guarded against any inconvenience that might arise to the State from the propagation of Convents : and, in my opinion, it is hardly necessary to disturb the quiet of those good Ladies who at present *conventize* in England ; and who, for the  
most



most part, are in a fair way of soon being extinct.—The bringing in of a new Bill for the purpose of preventing them from increasing, can, at this season, only tend to create alarms, and make the people believe that there is *danger* where there is *no danger*.—But this I say with all due deference to the Legislature; who certainly ought to know best what is for their country's good, and to whose decisions every individual must bend.

As to the celibacy of *our* Clergy, as it is not dangerous to the State, so I am persuaded that no person of sense will deem it hurtful, or at least very hurtful, to Society. I do not believe, that all the Priests in the Island amount to 300; at least they cannot be many more: now what can a population of eight millions suffer from the single life of 3 or 400 persons? Besides, it is well known that some of these, tired of a single life, or from other motives, shake off their celibatary fetters, marry, and read their recantation; and I am not sure, but that the Celibacy of the Roman Catholic Clergy

Clergy procures more profelytes to the Protestant Religion, than any other cause. Indeed, it is not the Celibacy of our Clergy that is hurtful to the Community, but the voluntary Celibacy of those who avoid Matrimony to commit with the greater freedom every sort of debauchery : and their number, I fear, is not easily calculated.

The remaining topics shall be dispatched in a very few words : and, first,

THE BLESSING AND CONSECRATING OF  
CHURCHES, ALTARS, BELLS, WATER,  
OIL, INCENSE, CANDLES, PALMS, ETC.  
ETC.

I am tempted to smile, when I hear these things made a cause of controversy. If Churches and Cœmeteries may be consecrated, as they are in the Church of England, why may not the Bells of Churches, the Altars or Communion-tables in Churches, the Ornaments of Churches, &c. &c. be also consecrated; that is, appropriated by prayer and benediction to sacred uses?—The same is to be said of *Blessed* or *Holy Water*—

*Blessed Oil*, to be used, according to the Roman rite, in Baptism, Confirmation, and Extreme Unction—*Blessed Candles* on the Feast of the Purification—*Blessed Palms* on Palm-Sunday—with a long string of other benedictions, which it would be tedious to enumerate. All these things are of themselves indifferent ceremonies; in their use, sometimes blended with superstition; and made of much more importance than they deserve: but they are harmless, at least, politically speaking; although, perhaps, they smell too much of Judaism for the pure and spiritual Religion of Jesus. But the Christians began very early to judaize, and in some respects to paganize also. The time will come, when all such trappings will be torn from the seamless robe of Christ; without injuring its original texture.—I proceed to

#### PILGRIMAGES :

Idle, useless, obsolete things. Who now ever thinks of travelling, through devotion, to Jerusalem, Rome, or Compostella?

BEADS,



BEADS, ROSARIES, MEDALS, AGNUS DEIS,  
SCAPULARS, ETC.

Pious play-things for old women and children : but if Government deem them *dangerous* to the State, let a rigorous law be made to prevent their future introduction ; and let those already imported be collected into a bundle, and disposed of as Luther wished to dispose of the Pope and Cardinals : let them be thrown into the sea ! The English Roman Catholics, in general, will not, I think, lament the loss : and the Devotees may count their *Paternosters* and *Ave-Marias* on their fingers, as readily as on a chaplet.

---

Having thus candidly stated the Dogmas and Discipline of Roman Catholics, such as they are at present professed by the majority of British Catholics ; and shown, I trust, that there is nothing in them that merits an exclusion of those who hold them from the privileges of British Subjects : I will next endeavour to show that the British Catholics are as faithful and loyal subjects, and have been so since the Revolution,

Revolution, and more particularly since the accession of the House of Hanover to the Throne of Britain, as their Protestant Brethren—in spite of the penal laws under which they have groaned, and the temptations they have had to abet rebellion.

I confine myself to this period for two reasons. First, that I may avoid entering into an useless controversy concerning the mutual insurrections of Papists against a Protestant, and of Protestants against a Popish Government in the reigns of Henry VIII. Edward VI. Mary and Elizabeth,—And, secondly, because I must allow that in the reign of the latter and of her successor many attempts were made by *some* Catholics to overturn their Government. I am not so sturdy a Roman Catholic as to defend any of those conspiracies, or to transfer the guilt of the Gun-powder plot from the shoulders of Catesby and his Popish associates to those of Cecil: but although it was a real Popish plot, it cannot with justice be called *the plot* of the English Catholics; and it will be  
found,

found, I believe, that no plot or conspiracy in that or the preceding reign was generally espoused by that body. Plots and conspiracies, however, there were : and I have no inclination to alleviate their heinousness.— In the reigns of both the Charleses the Roman Catholics of England are allowed to have been loyal, and sometimes suffered for their loyalty. Yet it was in the latter of these reigns, without any insurrection or plot on the side of the Catholics, that new laws were passed against them, and the Test and Corporation Acts made a test of their fidelity.

If, under a Roman Catholic King, they wished to be restored to their original rights, it was surely a very natural one ; such a wish as we believe would be cherished by Protestants in similar circumstances.

They rejoiced to see themselves emancipated from legal fetters, even by an illegal deed ; such a deed, however, as had often before been done by James's predecessors : nor were the Roman Catholics the only denomination of Christians who applauded the Royal Proclamation. It is even probable



probable that, if James had gone no further than this in his arbitrary career, his throne would not have been shaken: and a general liberty of conscience might, in time, have been legally established. But his *Protestant* Council, and his *Popish* Confidants, hurried him on to his ruin; against the opinion and advice of his own sensible Consort, and of the more sober, thinking Catholics of the nation. Some few of them followed his fortunes; but the bulk remained quiet, and submitted to his successor.

Still James had many secret friends both in England and Scotland: but these were not all Roman Catholics: I may safely venture to say, that by far the greater number were Protestants, and chiefly Protestants of the Church of England; whom the Doctrine of *Passive Obedience* and *Non-resistance* held, yet, fast in its fascinating manacles. It was this, and not Religion, that made a considerable part of both nations discontented with the Revolution;

and suggested various plans for restoring James to what, by them, was deemed his inalienable birth-right.

The Roman Catholics had, certainly, stronger reasons for wishing a Restoration than the Protestants; yet they were neither the foremost nor the most active in efforts to bring it about. Among those who refused to take the Oaths of Allegiance, I find only one Popish Peer: whereas there were at least six Protestant Lay Peers; beside the Archbishop of Canterbury, and the Bishops of Norwich, Ely, Gloucester, Worcester, Peterborough, and Bath and Wells: who, for this reason, were all at first suspended, and, persevering in their obstinacy, were afterwards deprived. These, and their party, wrote a number of Tracts in favour of *indefeasible Right*; and considered Sherlock as an Apostate for going over to the other side. They ridiculed King William's character, inveighed against his measures, and accused him of sacrificing the concerns of

5

England

England, to the advantage of his own country.—The Scottish Nonjurors, (now persecuted by the Presbyterians, openly courted William's favour; but at the same time maintained a correspondence with the Court of St. Germain: which connived at their external submission to William, the more effectually to serve the interests of James. The three Scotchmen who were this year (1691) suspected of disaffection were all Protestants.

The Parliament, indeed, was amused with a pretended conspiracy of the Papists in Lancashire. Several persons were seized, and some witnesses examined: but nothing appeared to justify the information: and Fuller, the chief evidence, was declared to be a notorious impostor, and sentenced to stand in the pillory. Next year, (1692) however, it appears that the Lancashire Papists did enter into a sort of conspiracy. They sent, it is said, one Lunt, or Lant, to the Court of St. Germain, with an assurance that they were in a disposition to receive their Old Sovereign: and



and Corner, Parker, and Johnson (a Popish Priest) are said to have undertaken the assassination of King William: but before they could execute their design, he had failed for Holland. But that this was not considered as a purely Popish plot, is clear from the prosecutions that followed. The Earls of Huntingdon and Marlborough were sent to the Tower—Ridley, Hastings, Knéwitt, and Ferguson, Esquires, were imprisoned in Newgate—The Earls of Dunmore and Middleton, and Sir Andrew Forrester were discovered in a Quaker's house, and secured—The Bishop of Rochester was confined to his own house—The Earls of Scarfsdale, Litchfield, and Newburgh, the Lords Griffin and Forbes, Sir John Fenwick, and Sir Theophilus Oglethorpe, were ordered to be apprehended, but found means to elude the search.

In 1694, a plot was said to have been contrived by certain Gentlemen of Lancashire and Cheshire; and Colonel Parker and one Crosby were imprisoned. But it afterwards appeared that this plot was a

contrivance of Lunt and his associate Taaffe, to procure money from Government.

In 1695, there is little doubt that the Jacobites in England were making preparations for a revolt. Sir John Freind had nearly completed a Regiment of Horse, Sir William Perkins was raising another, Sir John Fenwick had enlisted four Troops. Col. Tempest had undertaken for a Regiment of Dragoons. Mr. Curzon was commissioned for another : and the malcontents in Suffolk intended to raise a third.—Some more desperate conspirators had formed a scheme of assassination; the instigator to which is believed to have been Sir George Barclay, who had served as an officer in James's army, and was a furious bigot in the religion of Rome. He imparted his design to Johnson a Popish Priest, to Charnock \*, Porter, and Sir William Perkins. Their secret was imparted to Pendergrafs, an Irish officer,

\* One of the two Fellows of Magdalen College, who had renounced Protestantism in the reign of James.

who discovered it to the Duke of Portland. He owned that he was a Roman Catholic; but declared that he did not think that any Religion could justify such a treacherous purpose. He had King William's hearty thanks for this seasonable instance of his probity.—A proclamation was immediately issued for apprehending the Duke of Berwick (supposed to be then in England), Sir G. Barclay, Major Lowick, George Porter, Cardel Goodman, Sir William Perkins, or any other of the conspirators.—A proclamation was also issued for apprehending Lord Montgomery and Sir John Fenwick.

On the 11th of March, Charnock, King and Keys, were convicted of imagining the King's death by assassination, and were executed at Tyburn on the 18th.—Sir John Freind and Sir William Perkins were, on the same charge, convicted; and executed at Tyburn on the 3d of April. Barclay escaped.—Mr. Collier, the celebrated Nonjuring Minister, and two of his brethren, were presented in the King's Bench



Bench for *absolving* Freind and Perkins :  
and Snatt and Cook were sent to Newgate.

It is not with any intention to heap reproach upon those Protestants who were enemies to the Revolution, and disaffected to William's government, that I have related those occurrences : but barely to show that the Roman Catholics were, on the whole, less sanguine in their endeavours to restore James than the Protestants : and when they conspired with Protestants for that purpose, it was not religion so much as the prejudice of *hereditary indefeasible Right* that induced them to join in such measures. So little had Religion to do in the matter, that it is now well known that Innocent XI. favoured the Revolution, and was the Friend of William \*.——Yet several odious proclamations were issued against the poor  
Papists

\* On this account, at the Congress of 1690, the English Minister joined with the others in making a solemn Declaration ; in which they protest before God, that their intentions were, never to make peace with Lewis XIV. until he had made reparation to the Holy See for

Papists during William's reign : and towards the end of it (in 1700) one Act was passed of the severest kind. It enacted, *That no Papist should be capable of inheriting any title of honour or estate within the kingdom—nor should be capable of purchasing any lands, tenements or hereditaments ; either in his own name, or in the name of any other person.*

During the first six years of Anne there was little disturbance either in England or Scotland. The success of her arms abroad, and plenty and prosperity at home, reconciled the Nation to her government : and the Scottish Nonjuring Clergy, being favoured by her, forgot for a while their *jure-divino* Doctrine, and acquiesced in *jure-de-facto*. The Scotch Union, however, which was ratified in the Scottish Parliament in 1706, gave great umbrage to the inhabitants of that country, and prepared whatever he had acted against it, and until he had annulled all those infamous proceedings against the Holy Father INNOCENT.—It was a common saying among the Nonjurors of that time, that this Pope was one of the *Innocent* causes of the Revolution.

the

the way for a projected descent from France in favour of the Pretender. Advice was brought in March, 1707, that he was come to Dunkirk, and ready to sail thence for the east coast of Scotland. And, in fact, a small fleet commanded by De Fourbin, with James and twelve battalions of land-forces, set sail for Edinburgh. Had they been able to land, there is no doubt but that they would have been joined by a very considerable number of adherents to the Pretender, who were ready to take up arms on his arrival. But his reliance was not principally upon the Roman Catholics : he depended more on the nonjuring Episcopalians, and even on the Presbyterians ; particularly in the more southern counties \*. But the expedition failed : and “ the land had rest ” for *seven* years ; save that some trifling disturbances now and then arose from the preaching of seditious sermons, the drinking of Tory-toasts, and the publishing of seditious libels. But neither the preachers nor the toast-givers, nor the writers, were Roman

\* See Hooke's *Negotiations*.



Catholics\*: nor do I find that any Roman Catholic, during that period, was

\* In 1709, Dr. Sacheverell's famous Sermons produced an impeachment against him in the House of Lords, for having maintained *That the means used to bring about the Revolution were unjustifiable—That the Toleration was unreasonable—That the Church of England was in peril—and that her Majesty's Administration tended to the destruction of the Constitution.* He was tried, and condemned by a majority of one; 60 votes against 59. He was suspended from preaching for three years: and his Sermons, referred to, were ordered to be burned by the Hangman, together with other books of a similar tendency. This disgrace procured him, the next year, a triumphant entry into Oxford; on his deliverance from *Whiggish* persecution. If he had been a Popish Priest, his fate, I suspect, would have been very different. In 1710 some officers of the army, for drinking *Damnation to the present Ministry*, were cashiered; but allowed to sell out. In 1712, a Preface to Bishop Fleetwood's Sermons was ordered to be burned in Palace Yard, as a *malicious and factious* publication. In 1713, the Rev. Hilkiah Bedford was convicted of publishing a book entitled *The Hereditary Right of the Crown of England asserted*, and was sentenced to three years imprisonment, and a fine of 1000 marks. And Steele's *Englishman* and *Crisis* were declared to be seditious libels: and their author was expelled the House of Commons for writing them.

charged

charged with *speaking, writing, or practising* any thing treasonable or seditious. Yet, while every other species of Dissenters were more or less relieved, no relief was given to them: but, on the contrary, a Proclamation was issued on the 4th of May, 1714, for *discovering and apprehending Popish Priests and Jesuits*; and an Act was passed that same year for rendering more effectual an Act passed in the 3d year of James I. entitled *An Act to prevent and avoid dangers which may grow by Popish Recusants*,—and for vesting in the Lords Justiciary (of Scotland) the power of inflicting the same punishments against Jesuits, Priests, and other trafficking Papists; which the Privy-Council of Scotland was empowered to do by an Act of the Scottish Parliament, entitled *An Act for preventing the growth of Popery*—And all this at a time when Popery, instead of *growing*, was in a deep and galloping consumption.

The Rebellion of the year 1715\* was not

\* “ A Rebellion (says Smollet) which, in all probability, would never have happened, had not the violence  
“ lent

not a Popish Rebellion, it was a Jacobite Rebellion. The Pretender having published a manifesto in 1714, asserting his right to these kingdoms, a proclamation was issued for putting the laws in execution against Papists, Nonjurors, and disaffected persons; occasioned by the Pretender's Declaration, and some tumults that had happened at Oxford and other places: and, soon after, Mr. Hornby, a gentleman of one of the Inns of Court, was arrested, as the author of a Libel, entitled *English Advice to the Freeholders of England*; which, the Proclamation says, was designed to promote the interest of the Pretender, and to raise disturbances at the approaching election of Members of Parliament.—But the interests of the Pretender were espoused by greater personages. The Earl of Marr, withdrawing himself from Court, went to Scotland, where he assembled the Jacobites of that country; among whom were the Marquises of

“lent measures of a Whig Ministry kindled such a  
 “flame of discontent in the nation, as encouraged the  
 “partisans of the Pretender to hazard a revolt.”

Huntly



Huntly and Tullibardine, the Earls of Nithsdale, Linlithgow, Traquaire, Southesk, Marischall, and Carnwath; the Viscounts Kilfyth, Kenmuir, Kingston, and Stormont; and the Lords Drummond and Rollo: only four of these were Roman Catholics. In England, Lord Oxford and Lord Bolingbroke were engaged in the enterprise; and Lord Duplin and Lord Landsdown were apprehended on suspicion of their disaffection. At the same time, six Members of the House of Commons\* were ordered to be apprehended. Meanwhile the Honourable James Murray, landing at Edinburgh, joined the Earl of Marr at Perth, who had there assembled about 5000 men, which were soon increased to above 10,000, of which a very small proportion were Roman Catholics. Mr. Forster, who accepted the post of General of the Pretender's troops in England, was not a Roman Catholic. The

\* Sir William Wyndham, Sir John Packington, Edward Harvey, Thomas Foster, John Anstis, and Corbet Kynaston.

Earl of Scarfdale and Sir Richard Vyvyan, who were arrested as disaffected subjects, were not Roman Catholics. The persons who were seized at Oxford were not Roman Catholics. James Painter, who had proclaimed the Pretender in Cornwall, was not a Roman Catholic. Brigadier Mackintosh, who joined Forster at Dunse, was not a Roman Catholic. Of the 1500 prisoners taken in Preston, scarce 300 were Roman Catholics. Lord Ch. Murray, Major Nairn, Capt. Lockhart, Capt. Erskine, Capt. Shaftoe, who were tried and convicted at Preston, were all Protestants. Mr. Paul, who was apprehended in the streets of London for being concerned in the late insurrection, was a Clergyman of the Church of England \*. How many of the 60 persons who were tried and convicted

\* In his last speech he professed himself a true and sincere member of that Church ; but not of the *Revolution Schismatical Church* : whose Bishops (he said) had abandoned the King, and shamefully given up their ecclesiastical rights, by submitting to the unlawful, invalid, Lay depravations authorised by the Prince of Orange.

at

at Liverpool, were Roman Catholics, I cannot say : but I am persuaded their number was less than that of their fellow Protestant Rebels. In short, it is evident, that the Rebellion of 1715 was a Rebellion not of Religious, but of Political, principles ; a Rebellion of violent Jacobites, against violent Revolutionists ; and chiefly conducted by Episcopalian Protestants.

Not only the public Insurgents were, for the most part, Protestants ; but the private Incendiaries were all of that communion. James Shepherd, a lad of 18, who was convicted of high treason in 1717 for conspiring the King's death, was a Nonjuring Protestant, who deemed it a meritorious action to make away with George, and went to execution like a martyr for the good old cause. He was attended at his death by a Nonjuring Clergyman, Orme, who was taken into custody on that account. If this *Orme* had been a Popish Priest, and that *Shepherd* a Papist, what indignant clamour would not have



have been raised against Popery!—Or, had any Popish Priest preached such seditious sermons as those of Edward Byffe, Rector of Portbury, who asserted that *King George was an Usurper*; and that *we had neither King, Parliament or Laws for 30 years past*; what an odium would not this have thrown upon every Popish Priest and every Papist in the realm!

The Spanish Invasion in 1719 was conducted by three Protestant Lords: the Earl of Marischall, the Earl of Seaforth, and the Marquis of Tullibardine; who landed at Kintail with about 400 men; and were joined by about 1000 Highlanders; but they were defeated by Gen. Wightman in the battle of Glenfields, and the Spaniards made prisoners of war. The three Scottish Lords concealed themselves in the Highlands; and although a reward of 2000 pounds was offered for taking any one of them, they all found means to escape.

From this period until the year 1722 there seems to have been great tranquillity  
in

in the kingdom : except that, now and then, some seditious papers appeared in *Mist's Journal*, and other *Protestant* publications. But in this year the King received certain advice of a conspiracy entered into by several of his subjects, in concert with traitors abroad, for raising a rebellion : on which was issued a Proclamation for putting in execution the Laws against Papists and Nonjurors ; and for commanding all *Papists and reputed Papists to remove from the cities of London and Westminster, and from within ten miles of the same ; and for confining Papists and reputed Papists to their habitations.* A Bill was also brought in for raising on Papists and Popish Recusants the sum of 100,000*l.* which, although opposed as looking a little too like *persecution*, was carried by a great majority.—Yet the Papists had the least hand in this conspiracy : unless John Plunket were one of that communion, I believe there was no other suspected to be concerned in it. The persons suspected, arrested, and tried, were the Bishop of Rochester, his Chaplain G. Kelly,

Christopher Layer, Esq. Dr. John Freind : all Protestants, and Protestants of the established Church. A proclamation was also issued, offering a reward of 1000l. for apprehending Thomas Carte, a Nonjuring Clergyman ; but he escaped to France : where he wrote a considerable part of his *History of Great Britain*. Two publishers of periodical Papers, *Nathaniel Mist* and *Thomas Payne*, were convicted of libelling the Government, and fined and imprisoned on that account. They were not Papists.

I come now to the last open act of Rebellion in this country ; that of 1745 ; which originated not among the Roman Catholics, although they had their share in it : but among the Scottish Episcopalians. The *primum mobile* in it was Sir John Murray of Broughton, who in 1743 assured the Pretender that his friends in Britain were so numerous, that an invasion would be successful without the aid of the French King ; and that, if he were but to appear among them in person, a numerous army would soon flock to his standard.



standard. The other English and Scottish Jacobites were not quite so sanguine; but promised that, if he would land in Britain, at the head of a regular army, they would supply him with provisions, carriages and horses: and many of them declared that they would take up arms and join him. He credulously believed the other party; and as he was too old and infirm to come himself, he sent his son Charles; who landed in the west of Scotland, accompanied by *seven persons*! The Protestant Laird of Lochiel was the first who joined him; whose example was followed by some other Chieftains. The Highlanders, naturally vindictive, had not yet forgotten the infamous massacre of *Glencoe*; nor the treatment which their regiment called the *Black-Watch* had received on their being forced to embark for Flanders, contrary to the assurances which they had received of never being sent abroad. This was considered as a national outrage, and still rankled in their souls. But they were not the only Scotch who espoused the cause of

Charles. The Earl (then called the Duke) of Perth, the Marquis of Tullibardine, Viscount Strathallan, Lord Nairn, Lord George Murray brother to the Duke of Athol, Lord Elcho, Lord Ogilvy, Lord Kilmarnock, Lord Balmerino, Lord Pitfligo, and many Country Gentlemen, almost all of the Episcopalian communion, joined, what they called, the Royal Standard, and proclaimed the Pretender by the name of James VIII. whose son Charles had been constituted his Regent. This latter, from his youth, affability, and personal appearance, won the affections of many; and he had soon about him a considerable army. At the head of it, after defeating the King's troops under Sir John Cope, he marched into England; where at Manchester he was joined by about 200 men, under the command of Colonel Townley. Some of these were Lancashire Papists. Except this pitiful number, not an Englishman appeared in his favour; although it is believed that he had many friends in the capital, who would have joined

joined him in case he had approached it. But his bad Fortune decided otherwise. He retreated precipitately to Scotland, was pursued, defeated, and narrowly escaped with his life. I need not say what prosecutions and forfeitures followed: the events are recent in our memory: I will only repeat, that neither the Rebellion of 1745, nor any of the preceding Rebellions since the Revolution, were Popish Rebellions; nor indeed Rebellions of Religion. They all proceeded from the same causes; namely, a rooted prepossession in favour of Hereditary Indefeasible Right; and real or supposed grievances under the *Orange* and *Hanoverian* Governments.

I fear I have been rather tedious on this subject: but I thought it was of some importance to show our Protestant Brethren, that the Roman Catholics of Great Britain have not been more guilty, nay have been generally less guilty, of seditious and rebellious practices, than other religious denominations: and that it was not their Religion, but their political Prejudices,



that made some of them disaffected to Government: prejudices common to them with a great number of Protestants; and which, till of late, were not fully eradicated in either profession.

But if the bulk of British Roman Catholics, and especially of the English Catholics, have continued obedient and submissive to Government, and to oppressive Laws, at least ever since the Revolution; what was not to be expected from them when a part of those Laws were repealed? And what may not be expected, if they be all repealed?—Since the first mitigation, above twenty years ago, have they discovered the smallest aversion to Government, or the smallest propensity to sedition? Their fidelity, their attachment to his Majesty, and their respect for the laws, have been unequivocally testified on every occasion: and, I believe, it is at this moment allowed that there is not a more loyal class of Subjects in his Majesty's dominions.

Say, then, ye wise Legislators of Britain!

tain ! can you deem it unreasonable in them to look for a total repeal of every Statute which deprives them of the rights and privileges of other Subjects ? Can you refuse them a boon, at their humble solicitation, which ought to be spontaneously presented to them ?—If the oaths which they have already taken be thought insufficient, which I hardly think they can ; let others be drawn up in more explicit terms, and as strong as they can be made ; without hurting their *Religious Principles* or *Prejudices* : and I have no doubt of a ready and cheerful compliance, on their part.—And ye, Ministers of our beloved Sovereign ! may we not expect your effectual concurrence in a measure which will more and more endear his Majesty to those of the Catholic persuasion ; and be applauded by all *moderate* Protestants in the Realm ?——To such I have addressed my *Apology* : nor can I think that I have addressed it in vain.

I have addressed my Address: not can I  
 at this time I have addressed it in vain.  
 I have come in the morning: To such I  
 have: and be attended by all members  
 his Majesty to those of the Catholic profes-  
 sion: and which will more and more enlar-  
 ge the ranks of the reformed: and in a  
 short of our beloved country: and may we  
 do justice on their part.—As I, Miss  
 have no doubt of a ready and cheerful  
 response to the efforts of the Friends: and I  
 as they can be made; without hurting their  
 in many excellent forms, and as strong  
 I understand it means: let others be shown  
 ready to do the thing in which we wish  
 to do:—the only which they have al-  
 ready done: as we have done: and pro-  
 tected: and a good: of the: solicitation,  
 the: of other subjects: Can you refuse  
 to look for a total repeal of every Statute  
 which affects them of the rights and pri-  
 vileges of other subjects?



---

## APPENDIX.



No. I.

HAVING had more than once occasion to appeal to the famous *Declaration* of the Gallican Clergy, in 1682; I thought that my learned Readers would not be displeased to see the whole Original; which is as follows:

CLERI GALLICANI DE ECCLESIASTICA POTESTATE  
DECLARATIO.

“ ECCLESIAE GALLICANÆ decreta et liberta-  
“ tes a majoribus nostris tanto studio propugna-  
“ tas, earumque fundamenta, sacris Canonibus et  
“ Patrum traditione nixa, multi diruere moljun-  
“ tur: nec desunt qui earum obtentu Primatum  
“ B. Petri, ejusque Successorum Romanorum  
“ Pontificum a Christo institutum, iisque de-  
“ bitam ab omnibus Christianis obedientiam,  
“ Sedisque Apostolicæ, in qua Fides præ-  
“ dicatur, et unitas servatur Ecclesiæ, reve-  
“ rendam omnibus gentibus majestatem im-  
“ minuere

“minuere non vereantur. Hæretici quoque  
 “nihil prætermittunt, quo eam Potestatem, quâ  
 “pax Ecclesiæ continetur, invidiosam et gra-  
 “vem Regibus et Populis ostendent : iisque  
 “fraudibus simplices animas ab Ecclesiæ ma-  
 “tris, Christi que adeo, communione dissocient.  
 “Quæ ut incommoda propulsemus, Nos Ar-  
 “chiepiscopi et Episcopi, Parisiis mandato Re-  
 “gio congregati, Ecclesiam Gallicanam repræ-  
 “sentantes, una cum cæteris Ecclesiasticis veris  
 “nobiscum deputatis, diligenti tractatu habito,  
 “hæc fancienda et declaranda esse duximus.”

I. “Beato Petro ejusque Successoribus Christi  
 “Vicariis ; ipsique Ecclesiæ rerum *spiritua-*  
 “*lium*, et ad æternam salutem pertinentium, non  
 “autem *civilium ac temporalium*, a Deo traditam  
 “potestatem ; dicente Domino, *Regnum meum*  
 “*non est de hoc mundo* ; et iterum : *Reddite quæ*  
 “*sunt Cæsaris, Cæsari ; et quæ sunt Dei, Deo* : ac  
 “proinde stare Apostolicum illud : *Omnis anima*  
 “*Potestatibus sublimioribus subdita sit ; non est*  
 “*enim Potestas nisi a Deo : quæ autem sunt, a Deo*  
 “*ordinatæ sunt : itaque, qui Potestati resistit, Dei*  
 “*ordinationi resistit*. Reges ergo et Principes, in  
 “Temporalibus, nulli Ecclesiasticæ Potestati,  
 “Dei ordinatione subjici, neque autoritate Cla-  
 “vium Ecclesiæ, directè vel indirectè deponi ;  
 “aut illorum subditos eximi a fide atque obedi-  
 “entia,

“ entia, ac præstito fidelitatis sacramento solvi,  
 “ posse; eamque sententiam publicæ tranquillitati  
 “ necessariam, nec minus Ecclesiæ quam Im-  
 “ perio utilem; ut Verbo Dei, Patrum Tra-  
 “ ditioni, et Sanctorum exemplis consonam, om-  
 “ nino tenendam.”

II. “ Sic autem inesse Apostolicæ Sedi ac Petri  
 “ Successoribus, Christi Vicariis, rerum spiritua-  
 “ lium plenam Potestatem, ut simul valeant atque  
 “ immota consistant Sanctæ Oecumenicæ Sy-  
 “ nodi Constantiensis a Sede Apostolica compro-  
 “ bata, ipsoque Romanorum Pontificum ac to-  
 “ tius Ecclesiæ usu confirmata, atque Eccle-  
 “ siæ Gallicanæ perpetua Religione custo-  
 “ dita Decreta, *De autoritate Conciliorum Ge-*  
 “ *neralium*; quæ sessione quarta et quinta conti-  
 “ nentur: nec probari a Gallicana Ecclesia, qui  
 “ eorum Decretorum, quasi dubiæ sint autori-  
 “ tatis ac minus approbata, robur infringant,  
 “ aut ad solum Schismatis tempus Concilii dicta  
 “ detorqueant.”

III. “ Hinc, Apostolicæ Potestatis usum mo-  
 “ derandum per Canones Spiritu Dei conditos,  
 “ et totius mundi reverentiâ consecratos: Valere  
 “ etiam regulas, mores, et instituta a Regno  
 “ et Ecclesia Gallicana recepta; Patrumque  
 “ terminos manere inconcussos: atque id perti-  
 “ nere ad amplitudinem Apostolicæ Sedis, ut  
 “ statuta



“ statuta et consuetudines, tantæ Sedis et Eccle-  
 “ siarum consensu firmatæ, propriam stabili-  
 “ tatem obtineant.”

IV. “ In Fidei quoque questionibus, præci-  
 “ puas Summi Pontificis esse partes, ejusque De-  
 “ creta ad omnes et singulas Ecclesias perti-  
 “ nere; nec tamen irreformabile esse Judicium,  
 “ nisi Ecclesiæ consensus accesserit.

“ Quæ, accepta a Patribus, ad omnes Ecclesias  
 “ Gallicanas, atque Episcopos, iis Spiritu Sancto  
 “ præidentes, mittenda decrevimus; ut idipsum  
 “ dicamus omnes, simulque in eodum sensu, et  
 “ in eadem sententia.”

If Edmond Richer had drawn up this De-  
 claration, it would have worn a different face,  
 and been much less favourable to the pretensions  
 of Rome. Yet Rome was not pleased with it,  
 even in its present form!

## No. II.

IT was once my intention to give here the whole Bull *In Coena Domini*, as it was lastly modelled by Paul V. But I find it is too long; and shall therefore only give a short account of its contents.—It excommunicates and anathematizes the *Hussites*, *Vicliffists*, *Lutherans*, *Zuinglians*, *Calvinists*, *Hugonotts*, *Anabaptists*, *Trinitarians*\*, and all other Heretics—All *Universities*, *Colleges*, or *Chapters*, who shall appeal from *Papal Mandates* to a *General Council*—*Pirates*, *Corfairs*, and all other *Sea-Robbers*; particularly those who infest the *Mediterranean*—Those who seize on *shipwrecks*—Those who impose new tolls and taxes unless authorized by common law, or by a special Licence from the *Apostolic See*—*Falsifiers of Apostolic Letters*, &c.—Those who afford arms to the *Turks*, or any nation hostile to the *Christian name*—Those who hinder provisions to be brought to *Rome*—Those who slay, mutilate, wound, imprison, or detain *Pilgrims* and

\* That is, the *Trisheites*.

others who have business at Rome, either in their coming or going.—Those who kill, hurt, strike, or incarcerate Cardinals, Legates, or Apostolic Nuncios, &c.—Those who appeal from the Decrees of Rome to Secular Courts; or drag Ecclesiastical persons before such Tribunals—Those who lay any taxes or contributions on Clerks, Prelates, and other Ecclesiastical persons, or upon Churches, Monasteries, and other Ecclesiastical Benefices, without a special licence from the Pope; whatsoever be their rank, pre-eminence or dignity; were it Regal or Imperial—All Judges, Magistrates, Notaries, Scribes, Executioners, who presume, in criminal cases, to interfere with Ecclesiastical persons; without a special and specific licence from the Holy See—Those who occupy and usurp the territories or goods of the Roman Church; in which are included, beside the *URBS ALMA ROMÆ*, the Kingdom of Sicily, the Islands of Sardinia and Corsica, the Patrimony of Peter in Tuscany, &c. &c. &c.

From those excommunications and anathematizations, no one beside the Pope himself can absolve the delinquents, unless they be at the point of death. In any other case, those who presume to absolve, are themselves excommunicated.—It concludes with these truly Pontifical words: “*Nulli ergo omnino hominum liceat hanc paginam nostræ excommunicationis, anathemati-*  
*zationis,*”



" zationis, interdicti, innovationis, declarationis,  
 " protestationis, sublationis, revocationis, commis-  
 " sionis, mandati et voluntatis infringere, vel ei  
 " ausu temerario contraire. Si quis autem hoc at-  
 " tentare præsumpserit, indignationem Omnipoten-  
 " tis Dei, ac Beatorum Petri et Pauli, Apo-  
 " stolorum ejus, se noverit incursum." Bulla-  
 rium ed. Cherubini, vol. iii. p. 253. Strange,  
 that the *Servant of the servants of God* should hold  
 such a language! and stranger still, that it  
 should be so long borne by the Christian *slaves*  
 of this *Servant of God's servants*!

## No. III.

## ORIGIN OF THE PONTIFICAL OATH.

IN the primitive ages of Christianity, it does not appear that any *Oath* or even simple *Promise* of Canonical Obedience was made at the time of Ordination. The early Christians, as I have already observed, considered Oaths of all kinds as contrary to the Gospel: and it was not until late in the annals of the Church, that they were introduced into Religion.

About the beginning of the ninth century, some Bishops, it seems, obliged those whom they were about to ordain, to swear, that they *were worthy of Orders, would do nothing contrary to the Canons, and would be obedient to the Bishop who ordained them, and to the Church in which they were ordained.* But the second Council of Chalons, in 813, absolutely forbids such Oaths, as dangerous: “ *Dictum est interea de quibusdam*  
 “ *Fratribus, quod eos quos ordinaturi sunt jurare*  
 “ *cogant, quod digni sint, et contra Canones non*  
 “ *sint facturi, et obedientes sint Episcopo qui eos*  
 “ *ordinat,*

“ ordinat, et Ecclesiæ in qua ordinatur : Quod  
 “ juramentum, *quia periculosum est*, omnes una  
 “ inhibendum statuimus.” Can. xiii. apud Lab-  
 be, tom. vii. p. 1275.

Among the *Excerpts* of Egbert, Archbishop of York, is a Canon forbidding Priests to *swear at all* : they are to speak the truth, in all things, simply and sincerely. “ Ut nullus sacerdos qui-  
 “ cunque cum juramento juret ; sed simpliciter  
 “ cum puritate et veritate omnia dicat.” Apud Labbe, tom. vi. p. 1587.

The first Oaths were *Military* Oaths, called *Sacramenta*. After these came Civil Oaths ; which were of two sorts, *Judicial* Oaths, and Oaths of *Fealty*, or *Allegiance*, which vassals and subjects were obliged to take to Lords and Sovereigns. From these the Clergy were not exempted ; save that their *professions* and *promises* were, generally, considered as equivalent to an Oath. That the Popes themselves were wont to make such Promises of fidelity, appears from a Letter of Charlemagne to Leo III ; in which we find the following words : “ Perlectis Excellen-  
 “ tiæ vestræ Literis, et auditâ decretali Cartulâ,  
 “ valde, fateor, gavisi sumus, seu in electionis  
 “ unanimitate, seu in humilitatis vestræ obedientia  
 “ et in promissionis ad nos fidelitate, &c.” Inter Epistolas Alcuini. Ep. 84.



Those *Oaths*, or *Promises*, of allegiance were short and simple ; as we learn from that ancient Formula in the *Laws of the Franks*. “ Promitto  
 “ partibus Domini mei Caroli Regis, et filiorum  
 “ ejus, quia fidelis sum, et ero diebus vitæ  
 “ meæ, sine fraude et malo ingenio.” Leg.  
 Franc. lib. iv. cap. 46. and Capitular. lib. ii.  
 can. 88.—A similar, but not quite so simple, a  
*Promise* was made to Charlemagne’s grandson,  
 Charles II. in 854. “ Ego Karolo, Hludovici  
 “ filio, ab ista die in antea fidelis ero, secundum  
 “ meum *savirum* (a barbarous Latin word for *sci-*  
 “ *entiam*), sicut Francus homo perfecte esse debet  
 “ suo Regi : sic me Deus adjuvet, et istæ reli-  
 “ quæ !”

In England, the more ancient Form was :  
 “ Ego juro, quod ab ista die in antea, ero fidelis  
 “ et legalis Domino nostro Regi et suis hæredi-  
 “ bus ; et fidelitatem et legalitatem ei portabo,  
 “ de vita, et de membro, et de terreno honore ;  
 “ et quod Ego eorum malum aut damnum nec  
 “ novero, nec audivero, quod non defendam \*  
 “ pro posse meo. Ita me Deus adjuvet, &c.”—  
 Apud Spelman. Glossar. p. 225. edit. 3.

Such were the first Oaths of Imperial and Re-

\* *Defendam* is here taken for *prohibeam* ; in the sense of the French *defendre*, to forbid.

gal Allegiance: in imitation of which great Lords framed Oaths to be taken by their *Vassals* and *Villains*. The Oath of the former runs thus: "Ego (Titius) juro supra hæc Sancta Evangelia, quod ab hac hora in antea, usque ad ultimum diem vitæ meæ ero fidelis tibi (Caio) Domino meo, contra omnem hominem, *excepto Imperatore et Rege.*" Ibid. p. 226.—But this did not content the Feudal Lords; and a larger and more explicit Oath was invented, with the following addition: "Ego juro, quod nunquam scienter ero in consilio, vel auxilio, vel in facto, quod tu amittas vitam vel membrum aliquod, vel quod tu recipias in personam aliquam læsionem, vel contumeliam; vel quod tu amittas aliquem honorem, quem nunc habes, vel in antea habebis. Et si scivero, vel audivero de aliquo, qui velit aliquod istorum contra te facere, pro posse meo, ut non fiat, impedimentum præstabo: et si impedimentum præstare nequivero, quam citò potero tibi nunciabo, et contra eum, prout potero, auxilium meum tibi præstabo. Et si contigerit te rem aliquam quam habes vel habebis, injustè vel fortuito casu amittere, eam recuperare juvabo, et recuperatam omni tempore retinere. Et si scivero, velle te justè aliquem offendere, et inde generaliter vel specialiter fuero requisitus, meum tibi sicut potero, præstabo

“ stabo auxilium. Et si aliquod mihi de secreto  
 “ manifestaveris, illud sine tua licentia nemini  
 “ pandam, vel per quod pandatur faciam. Et  
 “ si consilium a me super aliquo facto postu-  
 “ laveris, illud tibi dabo consilium, quod mihi  
 “ videtur magis expedire tibi. Et nunquam  
 “ ex persona mea aliquod faciam, scienter quod  
 “ pertineat ad tuum vel tuorum injuriam,  
 “ vel contumeliam.” This Oath was mighty  
 pleasing to the Barons; and soon was used in  
 every Court, as the completest Oath of *Faalty* that  
 could be devised.—But Pope Gregory VII.  
 whose great ambition it was to make all the  
 Powers on earth feudatory to the Bishop of  
 Rome, improved even upon this Oath, and de-  
 vised a model, which it is impossible to outrival,  
 to be taken by the Prince of Capua : and which  
 I here give verbatim in the original.

*JUSJURANDUM Fidelitatis, quod fecit Richardus  
 Princeps Domino suo Gregorio Papæ.*

“ Ego Richardus, Dei gratia et S. Petri,  
 “ Capuæ Princeps, ab hac hora, et deinceps, ero  
 “ fidelis Sanctæ R. Ecclesiæ, et Apostolicæ Sedi,  
 “ et tibi Domino meo Gregorio universali Papæ.  
 “ In consilio, vel in facto, unde vitam aut mem-  
 “ brum perdas, vel captus sis mala captione,  
 “ non ero. Consilium quod credideris mihi, et  
 “ contradixeris ne illud manifestam, non mani-  
 “ festabo



“ festabo ad tuum damnum, me sciente. Sanctæ  
 “ Romanæ Ecclesiæ tibi que adjutor ero, ad te-  
 “ nendum, et acquirendum, et defendendum re-  
 “ galia Sancti Petri, ejusque possessiones, rectâ  
 “ fide, contra omnes homines; et adjuvabo te,  
 “ ut securè et honorificè teneas Papatum Roma-  
 “ num; terram Sancti Petri ejusque possessiones  
 “ et principatus nec invadere, nec acquirere  
 “ quæram, nec etiam deprædari \* presumam  
 “ absque tua, tuorumque successorum, qui ad  
 “ honorem Sancti Petri intraverint, certa licen-  
 “ tia; præter illam quam tu mihi concedes, vel  
 “ tui concessuri sunt successores. Pensionem de  
 “ terra S. Petri, quam ego teneo et tenebo,  
 “ sicut statutum est, rectâ fide studebo, ut illam  
 “ Sancta Romana annualiter habeat Ecclesia.  
 “ Omnes quoque ecclesias, quæ in mea persistunt  
 “ dominatione, cum earum possessionibus, di-  
 “ mittam in tuam potestatem, et defensor illa-  
 “ rum ero, ad fidelitatem Sanctæ R. Ecclesiæ.  
 “ Regi vero Henrico, cum a te admonitus fuero  
 “ vel a tuis successoribus, jurabo fidelitatem, *sal-*  
 “ *va tamen fidelitate Sanctæ R. Ecclesiæ.* Et si  
 “ tu vel tui successores ante me ex hac vita mi-  
 “ graverint, secundum quod monitus fuero a  
 “ melioribus Cardinalibus et Clericis Romanis  
 “ et Laicis, adjuvabo ut Papa eligatur et ordine-

\* The word seems here to mean *hunting*.

“ tur ad honorem S. Petri. Hæc omnia supra-  
 “ scripta observabo S. R. Ecclesiæ et tibi, rectâ  
 “ fide : et hanc fidelitatem observabo tuis suc-  
 “ cessoribus ad honorem S. Petri ordinatis, si  
 “ mihi firmare voluerint *investituram* a te mihi  
 “ concessam. Datum Capuæ VIII. Calend. Octo-  
 “ bris Indictione duodecima \*.” Apud Labbe,  
 tom. x. p. 23. — A similar Oath, and almost  
*totidem verbis*, was taken to Gregory by Robert  
 Duke of Calabria and Sicily, in 1080, followed  
 by this curious Form of *Investiture*: “ Ego Gre-  
 “ gorius Papa invellio te, Roberte dux, de terra  
 “ quam tibi concesserunt antecessores mei sanctæ  
 “ memoriæ Nicolaus et Alexander. De illa au-  
 “ tem terra quam *injustè* tenes, sicut est Salernus  
 “ et Amalphia, et pars marchię Firmanæ, *nunc*  
 “ patienter sustineo, in confidentia Dei omnipo-  
 “ tentis et *tuæ bonitatis*, ut tu postea exinde ad  
 “ honorem Dei et S. Petri ita te habeas, sicut et  
 “ te agere et me suscipere decet, sine periculo  
 “ animæ meæ et tuæ.”

The Oath required to be taken by the Empe-  
 ror Rodolphus was as follows : “ Ab hac hora  
 “ et deinceps fidelis ero, per rectam fidem B. Pe-  
 “ tro Apostolo ejusque Vicario Papæ Gregorio,  
 “ qui nunc in carne vivit : et quodcunque mihi  
 “ ipse Papa præceperit, sub his videlicet verbis ;  
 “ *Per veram obedientiam*, fideliter, sicut oportet

\* In the year 1073.

“ Christianum, observabo. De ordinatione vero  
 “ Ecclesiarum, et de terris vel censu, quæ Con-  
 “ stantinus Imperator, vel Carolus, S. Petro de-  
 “ derunt, et de omnibus ecclesiis vel prædiis,  
 “ quæ Apostolicæ Sedi ab aliquibus viris vel  
 “ mulieribus aliquo tempore sunt oblata vel  
 “ concessa, et in mea sunt vel fuerint potes-  
 “ tate, ita conveniam cum Papa, ut peri-  
 “ culum sacrilegii et perditionem animæ meæ  
 “ non incurram: et Deo Sanctoque Petro,  
 “ adjuvante Christo, dignum honorem et uti-  
 “ litatem impendam: et eo die, quando illum  
 “ (Gregorium) primitus videro fideliter per mā-  
 “ nus meas *miles Sancti Petri et illius* efficiar.”

Apud Lab. tom. x. p. 279.

There are two forms of an Oath taken, in 1081, to the same Pope, by Bertrann, Count of Provence, the shortest of which is as follows:

“ Ego Bertrannus, Dei gratia, Comes Provinciæ,  
 “ ab hac hora et deinceps tibi Domino meo Pa-  
 “ pæ Gregorio et cunctis successoribus tuis, qui  
 “ per meliores Cardinales S. R. E. electi fuerint,  
 “ fidelis ero: et quidquid mihi credideritis, in  
 “ damnum vestrum, me sciente, non manifestabo.  
 “ Sic me Deus adjuvet, et hæc Sancta Evange-  
 “ lia!”

These are all the Forms of *Fealty Oaths* which I find in the *Register* of Gregory: and they are



taken by secular Princes.— But in the sixth Roman Council, convened by Gregory in 1079, I find an oath taken by the Archbishop of Aquileia in the following words: “ Ab hac hora  
 “ et in antea fidelis ero B. Petro et Papæ Gregorio,  
 “ suisque successoribus, qui per meliores Cardina-  
 “ les intraverint. Non ero in consilio, neque in  
 “ facto, ut vitam aut membra, aut Papatum per-  
 “ dant, aut capti sint mala captionem. Ad syno-  
 “ dum, ad quam me vocabunt, vel per se, vel per  
 “ suos nuntios, vel per suas literas, veniam; et  
 “ canonice obediam; aut, si non potero, legatos  
 “ meos mittam. Papatum Romanum et regalia  
 “ Sancti Petri adiutor ero ad retinendum et de-  
 “ fendendum, salvo meo ordine. Consilium vero  
 “ quod mihi crediderint per se, aut per nuntios  
 “ suos, siue per literas, nulli pandam. Legatum  
 “ Romanum eundo et redeundo honorificè trac-  
 “ tabo, et in necessitatibus suis adjuvabo. His,  
 “ quos nominatim excommunicaverint, scienter  
 “ non communicabo. Rom. Ecclesiam per *se-*  
 “ *cularem militiam* fideliter adjuvabo, cum invi-  
 “ tatus fuero. Hæc omnia observabo, nisi quan-  
 “ tum sua certa licentia remanserit.” Apud  
 Labbe, tom. x. p. 379.

That this, also, is an Oath of *Faith*, and not an Ordination Oath, is evident from its tenor, and the occasion on which it was taken. Nor  
 does

does it appear, that hitherto any other Oath, or Promise, was required of Bishops at the time of their Ordination, than a mere *Promise of Canonical Reverence and Obedience*.

The first intimation which I find of an Episcopal Oath (*Juramentum*) is in a Letter of Paschal II. to the Archbishop of Palermo; who had written to him that the Princes and Nobles of Sicily were *astonished* that the *Pallium* had been offered to the Archbishop, on condition only, that he should take an oath prescribed to him by the Pope\*. I shall give their objections, with Paschal's answer, in the Pontiff's own words:

“ Aiunt, omne jusjurandum a Domino, in  
 “ Evangelio, esse prohibitum, nec ab Apostolis  
 “ post Dominum, nec in Conciliis inveniri posse  
 “ statutum: Quid est ergo quod Dominus sub-  
 “ sequenter ait: *Quod amplius est a malo est?* Hoc  
 “ enim amplius ut exigamus malum nos, illo  
 “ permittente, compellit. Nonne malum est ab  
 “ Ecclesiæ unitate et Sedis Apostolicæ obedientia  
 “ resiliire, et contra Canonum statuta prorumpere,  
 “ quod multi etiam post sacramentum præstitum  
 “ præsumpserunt? *Hoc nimirum malo ac necessi-*  
 “ *tate compellimur juramentum pro fide, pro*  
 “ *obedientia, pro unitate requirere.*—Aiunt, in

\* It is a pity that the Archbishop's Letter is lost.

“ *Conciliis*

“ *Concilii statutum non inveniri : quasi Romanæ*  
 “ *Ecclesiæ legem Concilia ulla præfixerint ;*  
 “ *cum omnia Concilia per R. Ecclesiæ autori-*  
 “ *tatem et facta sint, et robur acceperint ; et in*  
 “ *eorum Statutis R. Pontificis patenter exci-*  
 “ *piatur autoritas. Cum igitur a Sede Apo-*  
 “ *stolica vestræ insignia dignitatis exigitis, quæ*  
 “ *a Beati Petri tantum corpore assumuntur ;*  
 “ *justum est, ut vos quoque Sedi Apostolicæ*  
 “ *subjectionis debita signa solvatis ; quæ vos cum*  
 “ *B. Petro tanquam membra de membro ha-*  
 “ *bere (vel hære) et Catholici capitis unitatem*  
 “ *servare declarent.*”—A strange mode of com-  
 menting Scripture this ! and a strange con-  
 tempt of Councils !

We find the same arguments, and others  
 equally *convincing*, used in his Letter to the  
 Archbishop of Poland \* ; the King and Nobles  
 of which nation were as much surprised at Pas-  
 chal's demand, as the Princes and Nobles of Si-  
 cily. All this shows that it was to them a novel  
 thing. Yet in that Letter he says that the  
 Danish and Saxon Metropolitans had made no  
 difficulty to take such an Oath : “ *Idem jura-*  
 “ *mentum asserunt, et legatos Apostolicæ Sedis ho-*  
 “ *norificè tractant, et in suis necessitatibus adjuvant,*  
 “ *et Apostolorum limina per legatos suos, non tantum*

\* Polonorum Archiepiscopo.

“ *per*



"*per triennium, sed annis singulis visitant.*" It is remarkable that all that I have put in Italics makes a part of the present *Pontifical Oath*; hence we may fairly conclude that it was first framed by Paschal; but on the model (*mutatis mutandis*) of those taken to Gregory VII. by the Prince of Capua, the Count of Provence, and the Archbishop of Aquileia: so that this domineering Pontiff may be justly considered as the legitimate parent of the present PONTIFICAL OATH; although it was not, most probably, in his Pontificate improved into its present form; nor generally imposed on all Bishops alike.

Indeed it seems, at first, to have been required only from Primates and Metropolitans, what time they received the Pallium, and not at the time of their ordination. We have seen how it was enforced by Paschal; in whose Pontificate it found its way into England; where the first who took it was Rodulphus, on his being translated from Winchester to Canterbury in 1114, after that see had been vacant five years, from the death of Anselm\*.

What was the particular form of that Oath our historians have not told us: but we may believe, it was not very different from that which was

\* See Eadmer. lib. v. p. 113. and Mat. Paris. ad hunc annum, p. 414.

taken to Gregory IX, by Archbishop Edmund, in 1234; which was published from a ms. in the Vatican by Baronius's Continuator, Raynaldus \*; and which, as far as it goes, is conceived in nearly the same words with the present Oath in the Pontifical; which I shall now give *verbatim* from the edition of Clement VIII, revised by Urban VIII. in 1644.

FORMA JURAMENTI.

“ Ego N. electus Ecclesiæ N. ab hac hora in  
 “ antea fidelis et obediens ero Beato Petro Apo-  
 “ stolo, Sanctæque Romanæ Ecclesiæ, et Do-  
 “ mino Papæ N. suisque successoribus canonicè  
 “ intransibus. Non ero in consilio, aut con-  
 “ sensu, vel facto, ut vitam perdant aut mem-  
 “ brum; seu capiantur mala captione; aut in  
 “ eos violenter manus quomodolibet ingerantur;  
 “ vel injuriæ aliquæ inferantur, quovis quæsito  
 “ colore. Consilium vero, quod mihi credituri  
 “ sunt per se aut nuntios suos seu Literas, ad  
 “ eorum damnum, me sciente, nemini pandam.  
 “ Papatum Romanum et [Regalia Sancti Petri]  
 “ adjutor eis ero ad retinendum et defendendum,  
 “ salvo meo ordine, contra omnem hominem. Le-  
 “ gatum Apostolicæ Sedis, in eundo et redeundo,

\* Annal. Ecclesiast. ad annum 1233.

“ hono-

" honorificè tractabo, et in suis necessitatibus ad-  
 " juvabo. Jura, honores, privilegia et auctorita-  
 " tem Sanctæ Romanæ Ecclesiæ, Domini nostri  
 " Papæ et successorum prædictorum conservare,  
 " defendere, augere et promovere curabo. Ne-  
 " que ero in consilio, vel factò, seu tractatu, in  
 " quibus contra ipsum Dominum nostrum, vel  
 " eandem Romanam Ecclesiam aliqua sinistra vel  
 " præjudicialia personarum, juris, honoris, status,  
 " et potestatis eorum machinentur : et, si talia  
 " a quibuscunque tractari vel procurari novero,  
 " impediam hoc pro posse ; et, quanto citius  
 " potero, significabo eidem Domino nostro, vel  
 " alteri, per quem possit ad ipsius notitiam per-  
 " venire. Regulas Sanctorum Patrum, decreta,  
 " ordinationes, seu dispositiones, reservationes,  
 " provisiones et mandata Apostolica totis viri-  
 " bus observabo, et faciam ab aliis observari.  
 " Hæreticos, schismaticos, et rebelles eidem Do-  
 " mino nostro vel successoribus prædictis pro  
 " posse persequar et impugnabo. Vocatus ad  
 " synodum veniam, nisi præpeditus fuero ca-  
 " nonica præpeditio. Apostolorum limina  
 " singulis trienniis personaliter per me ipsum vi-  
 " sitabo ; et Domino nostro, ac successoribus  
 " præfatis rationem reddam de toto meo pasto-  
 " rali officio, ac de rebus omnibus ad meæ Ec-  
 " clesiæ statum, ad Cleri et Populi disciplinam,  
 " animarum



" animarum denique, quæ meæ fidei traditæ  
 " sunt, salutem, quovis modo pertinentibus; et vi-  
 " cissim mandata Apostolica humiliter recipiam,  
 " et quam diligentissime exequar. Quod si legi-  
 " timo impedimento detentus fuero, præfata om-  
 " nia implebo per certum nuntium, ad hoc speci-  
 " ale mandatum habentem, de gremio mei Ca-  
 " pituli, aut alium in dignitate Ecclesiastica  
 " constitutum, seu alias personatum habentem;  
 " aut, his mihi deficientibus, per diocesanum  
 " Sacerdotem; et, Clero deficiente omnino, per  
 " aliquem alium Presbyterum, sæcularem vel re-  
 " gularem, spectatæ probitatis et religionis, de  
 " supradictis omnibus plene instructum. De  
 " hujusmodi autem impedimento docebo per le-  
 " gitimas probationes ad Sanctæ Romanæ Ec-  
 " clesiæ Cardinalem proponentem in Congre-  
 " gatione Sacri Concilii, per supradictum nun-  
 " tium transmittendas. Possessiones vero ad men-  
 " sam meam pertinentes non vendam, nec do-  
 " nabo, neque impignorabo; nec de novo in-  
 " feudabo, vel aliquo modo alienabo, etiam cum  
 " consensu Capituli Ecclesiæ meæ, inconsulto  
 " Romano Pontifice: et si ad aliquam aliena-  
 " tionem devenero, pœnas in quadam super hoc  
 " edita Constitutione contentas eo ipso incurrere  
 " volo. Sic me Deus adjuvet, et hæc Sancta Dei  
 " Evangelia!"

Surely a more absolute *vassalage* was never imposed on mankind by the most despotic Princes, than is here imposed on every Bishop at the time of his Ordination, by one of their own Order, forgetting his origin, and exalting himself above the sons of men ! Yet to this *vassalage* Bishops have tamely submitted for several centuries ! *Quousque tandem ?*

THE END.





